INNOCENCY and TRUTH VINDICATED:

OR,

A Sober REPLY to Mr *WILL's* ANSWER to a Late TREATISE of BAPTISME.

Wherein the Authorities and Antiquities for Believers, and againſt *Infants Baptiſm*, are Defended, and the miſ-repreſentations and Forgeries he boaſts of, all returned upon himſelf.

With a brief Anſwer to Mr *Blinmans* Eſſay.

By *Henry Danvers.*

Ut ex lapidum attritu ignis elicitur, ſic ſæpe veritas ex alternantium imo & altercantium ſermonum conflictu. Lipſius.

Prov. 18. 17. *He that is firſt in his own Cauſe, ſeemeth juſt; but his Neighbour cometh and ſearcheth him.*

Printed for *Francis Smith*, at the Elephant and Caſtle near the Royal Exchange in *Cornhill*, 1675.

BIBLIOTHECA·BODLEIANA

THE PREFACE

IT is an Ancient and well approved Maxim among the Learned, that the more truth is winnowed and sifted, the more opposed and contended against, the more transparent and illustrious it appears. Veritas ventilata plus rutilat & impugnata magis elucescit.

A further confirmation whereof you may meet with, from the late opposition Mr. Will's *hath made against the truth, in his late Book called* Infants Baptisme treated and vindicated by Scripture and Antiquity, *in an Answer to a* treatise, by Mr. H.D. *&c.*

Wherein notwithstanding the diligent search, he tells us, he has made in the University Library at Oxford, *the utmost assistance that all the learned writers, Mr.* Marshall, Baxter, Cobbet, Cotten, Holmes, *&c. can give him to disprove and weaken the Authorities urged from Scripture and Antiquity for Believers against* Infants Baptisme, *yet you'l finde they serve but so much the more to illustrate that truth he pretends to foil, giving only an opportunity for further confirmation and ratification, and to create more full satisfaction or conviction to any that have been in suspence, as to the truth of any of those* Authorities *urged by me. Wherein notwithstanding his great flourish and noyse you'l finde he is not able to reprove the truth so much as of*

one of those many Authorities in the Historical part, and excepting that one in the Doctrinal part, viz. Calvin for Eclectus, not another that is considerable in the whole Book.

Therefore all that I have to ask of the Candid Reader (at whose Barr the matter is now brought betwixt Mr. Will's and me) is only to do themselves and the truth in Question so much right as to afford the Common Justice of an open Ear; that having heard the Recrimination, they will also intend to what is said herein for vindication.

Wherein you have his Arguments duely weighed, and refuted, his cavilling exceptions answered, his pretended forgeries, and falshoods, disproved, the Antiquities of Believers Baptisme defended, the innovation, grounds, Traditions, and novelty of Infants Baptisme confirmed. The witness against it by eminent men and famous Churches for many ages maintained, his injurious Calumnyes and reproaches (that he not only assignes to the Professors of beliefull Baptisme with, but the Profession it self also) detected and refuted. The grievous [illegible] custome of sprinkling instead of Dipping further evinced. [illegible]

[illegible] be haughty, bitter, wrathfull, fraudulent, provoking spirits, he appears in through his whole Book, [illegible] Christian Reader, [illegible] shall, the least [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

ter and sound Argument with brage, clamour and noyse.

The Scripture arguments 'tis true I have little medled with, and that for these following reasons.

First, because the Historical part upon which so much stress hath been laid (though the leaneſt part of the controversy) was the principal new thing added by me (it being as Mr. Will's observes, next to an impossibility to offer any new Scripture, or almost any new Argument that hath not been before urged in the controversy;) and is mainly therefore by him opposed.

Secondly, Because he has ingeniously confeſs'd, that there is no expreſs Scripture for the same; And so many of themselves with one Mouth have owned, the necessity of expreſs Scripture to warrant and justify the practise of every part of Gods worſhip, and that to practise any thing in the worſhip of God without expreſs warrant from the Word, is superstition and false worſhip. And that such a Principle ought to be held fast as the great Proteſtant Bulwark to secure us against all Popish Innovations and Traditions: and which is a sufficient answer out of their own Mouthes against any thing they urge from pretended inferences and farr-fetch't Conſequences, being all that can possibly be said for it.

Thirdly, because M. Toombes hath now given a particular Answer to him and Mr. Blinman therein, who being none of those rigid Anabaptists that Mr. Will's expreſſeth so much enmity against, his Arguments may be more acceptable to him.

And 4ly. because I intend to do it more particularly hereafter, (if God please to by it self, having yet much to reckon with Mr. Will's for his further abuſes, and grand miſtakes in the Doctrinal part.

In the next place, it is very observable, and I desire the Reader to take special notice of it, that the things he would so

injuriously Father upon me he is himself found foulty guilty of; making good Prov. 26. 27. *and of which I shall point you to a few instances,* viz.

First, that the forgeries and prevarications he charges upon me, do all return upon himself; and not one of them made good against me, as appears from l. 1. *to* p. 29.

Secondly, that the several falshoods he lays to my charge are all of them of his own making and not one of them to be proved against me, as is particularly evidenced from p. 29. *to* p. 62.

Thirdly, the notorious abuse he has put upon Authors by forgery, curtilations, mis-quotation, mis-translation, and which fully appears by the following instances, viz.

1. *by making an Authority of his own for* Infants Baptisme, *and fathering it upon* Basil *in the* 4. Cent. *in his Book* contra Eunom, *and asserting it to be the very next lines to what I had repeated from him, thence reproving me for unfaithfullness, in leaving it out, and to be duely suspected in all my Quotations, when not one sillable of any such thing is to be found in him as demonstrated* p. 43. *to* 49.

2. *For mis-translating, mis-representing, abusing and curtailing* Greg. Nazien. *as appears,* p. 8. *and* 9. *and* p. 47. *and* 48.

3. *For his curtailing and abusing the old confession of the* Waldenses, *leaving out a considerable part thereof, and then making flourishes and inferences upon it, as* p. 110.

4. *By abusing his Reader with a supposititious Testimony, of* Athanasius, *when the Author from whom he brings it owns it to be forged,* p. 37, 38, 39. &c.

5. *His egregious unfaithfullness in that notorious abuse he puts upon* Osiander, *pretending that he certifies several things out of* Peter Clumacenses, *against* Peter Bruis, *belonging to the* 12. Cent. *when he knew them to be the Lying slanders of the Monks inquisitors against the* Albegois, *in*

the

the 13. Canons, and of which he picks only 5. particulars out of 20. as p. 118. to 123.

6. *His abusing, and mistranslating, a passage out of Cassander quite contrary to what he expresseth; falsly thereby accusing the Ministers for the very crime therein he acquits them, p. 160. to 163.*

7. *His abusing* Erasmus, *telling us that he testifyes in his Censura before* Origens Homelyes *on the* Romans, *that it was* Jeroms *Version, and not* Ruffinus's; *and that* Jeroms Preface *was prefixed thereto; Whereas* Erasmus *saith the quite contrary in both, viz. First, that it did appear to be Ruffinus's and not Jeroms, and 2ly, that the said* Preface *was a cheat of the Booksellers, and none of* Jeroms, *as p. 86.*

8. *His abusing his Reader by a Quotation from* Vincentius, *as though he testifyed, that till* Luthers *time none deny'd* Infants Baptism, *when he doth the quite contrary in the same place, giving an Account of so many before Luther that did it, viz.* Vincentius, Victor, Hinemarus, Henrici, *and* Apostolici, Wickliff, Strabo, Vives, *&c. as p. 127.*

9. *By further abusing the Reader in telling him, that* Rainarius *in his Catalogue of the* Waldensian *errors, gives not in their denying of* Infants Baptism *as a great Argument they were for it being one of the Monks inquisitors employed to that end; when he doth it expresly in* Totidem verbis, *as p. 125.*

10. *His double dealing about Dr.* Taylors *Arguments against* Infants Baptism *in his* Liberty of Prophecy, *suggesting as though Dr.* Taylor *himself and Dr.* Hammond *had refuted them, whereas they suppose most of them to retain good against those common pleas for* Infants Baptism; *but do not undertake to answer them because many of those Arguments*

a

Arguments usually brought by Pædobaptists are not good in themselves. p. 52.

Fourthly, Fearful obstinacy or heedlessness, repeating my words truly in one place; and yet afterwards Fathering the quite contrary upon me; as p. 32.

Fifthly, Notoriously partial in his Answers all the Book through, replying to some things he judges weak, and leaving others unanswered, and yet vaunting over the whole: as for instance, *in the 4. Cent. I give the sayings of 10 Fathers for* adult Baptisme, *he replys only to 4. of them, saith not a word to the rest, and yet concludes against them all,* as p. 6. &c. *So in like manner as to the 10. Instances given from the most eminent men not baptized till aged, though the children of Christian Parents, replys only to 4. and not a word to the other 6. and yet concludes against them all, as though he had particularly answered to them,* as p. 11. to 15. (though his reply as you'l finde, is insignificant in both as his silence.) *And further I produce 3. Councils in the 4. Cent. for the same, to which he weakly replyes,* he can produce 3 times ten Councells for Infants Baptism, *viz. in after-centuryes when by Popish Councells it was injoind and imposed* as p. 10. *And again I quote* Spanhæmius *and* Osiander *to prove a thing, he takes notice only of* Spanhæmius *that speaks to part, but not to* Osiander *that speaks to the whole; and yet, reproves me for my mistake* as p. 148. &c.

And further he allows two witnesses for Beleevers Baptism *only,* viz. Boemus *and* Srabo, *and yet leaves multitudes of them unexcepted against, & unreplyd to,* as p. 2. &c. *In like manner excepts against but 6. of above 40. particular witnesses against* Infants Baptisme, *and yet allows but 2.* viz. Hincmarus *and* Adrianus, as p. 104, 105. *And again, I quote eleven several Churches denying* Infants Baptism, *he except only against 3 saith nothing to all the rest, yet owns none of them.* p. 17.

Sixthly,

Sixthly, the inveteracy of spirit testified all along both against the professors and profession it self of Beleivers Baptism only, especially in his railing and false accusations, from p. 145. to 171.

As for my Epitomizing *and repeating some of Mr* Tombes *s Arguments, and not alwayes mentioning his name, which he calls* Plaigiarisme, *I do confess in that my collection, I have not so punctually mentioned all our own party from Book to book, wherein (except in the Historical part) I do little more then bring to remembrance, in a new Method (for the benefit of the present age) what has heretofore in large Treatises been writ upon this subject, which I think is usual in Polemical writings, & if I mistake not, Mr* Sydnham *doth the same thing without mentioning of names, from whom the arguments are brought (which may be endless;) And if I have been thereby injurious to any I beg their pardon; I am sure I have not been so to the truth; But herein I conceive Mr* Will *s hath not dealt fairly, 1st to reprove me for the same thing he doth himself, for I could draw paralelle too upon him if I would be troublesome and impertinent; and 2ly to avoid answering the force of the Arguments, upon pretence they are anothers not my own, which I conceive favours little of ingenuity and will scarse go for current pay.*

It is true, it must be owned that Mr Tombes *how much soever slighted by* M. Will *s (though in some things very different from most that own this way) hath done very worthily in this controversy, & was an eminent instrument that God raised up among it the learned to plead and defend that despised truth, & whose learned labours and unanswered Books do witness for him in the gate; though* M. Will *s is pleased so ignorantly to vaunt it, & tell us in his Epistle, that the Arguments for* believers against *Infants Baptisme* are a parcel of Trite

over-

overworn things, a nauseous crambe or repitition *of old* routed Arguments, that had been in effect trampled upon and confuted again and again, *though his Anti-pædobaptism in 3 parts, containing neer as I judge 1500. pages in quarto, replying to what had been written by above 20 several persons are all of them, if I am not misinformed unreplied to to this day*

And further, I must inform the Reader that had any modest endeavours prevailed, these things had more privately (without this troubleing the world) been rectifyd between Mr Will's *and me, But he having as he tells us received from the learned his* Album calculum, *or approbation, would not by any means be stopt in his career for the supposed victory and glory; And how far he has merrited that high* Encomium *given by his* Imprimatur, M.B. *in his Epistle Recommendatory is to be considered, who tells us,* that much thanks is due to him the reverend Author from the Church *for* answering my Arguments satisfactorily, and by searching into, & so fully confuting all my pretended antiquities, thereby defending (*as he saith*) Gods truth & the Churches right; whilst other of his bretheren by ignorance and sloth, treacherous silence or silly unsatisfactory Arguings, have betrayd the cause.

But whether instead of the Churches thanks they ought not both (in Mr B's *own language) to have the Church told of them, for pestering the world with such impertinencyes, one for his needless writing of them, and the other for his rash and careless Commendation, is submitted to judgment.*

And lastly, Whether it is not now demonstrably evident to all men that will impartially consider, that notwithstanding the confident vain-glorious boast of these great undertakers, that tell better proof be manifested there as yet appears as little Antiquity for Infants Sprinkling in the first Ages, as (they themselves acknowledge) express scripture for the same.

THE WITNESSES FOR Believers Baptisme Freed from Forgery and Prevarication.

CHAP. I.

The Baptisme of Believers, *with the* Authorities *urged for the necessity of* Confession *of Faith before it; is* defended *and the Quotations out of the* Magdeburg's, *vindicated from Mr.* Wills's *charge of* Prevarication *and* Falshood.

THe *Method* I shall observe herein, shall be to give you a briefe account of the *Antiquities*, and *Authorities* brought by me, to prove the necessity of *Faith* before *Baptisme*; and then his *Exception* against them, and my *Reply* thereto: whereby the Reader may be able to make an *easie*, and *speedy* judgement, at whose door the *Prevarications* and Falshoods lye.

Having, as you'l find, in the 6. first Chapters by 6. Arguments from positive scripture proved: That Believers upon Profession of Faith,

are the only Subjects of Baptesme; did in my 7. Chapter (by way of *Illustration* only) confirm the same, from the eminent *Testimony* that had been born thereto, throughout all ages. Firmly witnessing, **That Confession and Profession of Faith, with true choice, was necessary before Baptisme**; And which evidence, as I have given it you, through all the Centuries, you may gather up under 2. Heads; First, *What hath been said thereto by the Ancients themselves, in the first four Centuries, before Infants Baptisme was enjoyn'd* (and how confirm'd by our moderne Writers); And secondly, *what witness of that kind hath been born thereto, after Infants Baptisme was imposed, as well by those that deny'd Infants Baptisme, as those that own'd, and practised it; not only of the Romish Church, but others through all the rest of the Centuries.*

All the Authorities under 2. Heads.

To which *Testimonies* Mr. *Wills* makes his *Exceptions*, charging me with *Prevarication*, in relating somethings *partially*, others *falsly*, and for the most part contrary to the *intention* of the Writers; and to that degree, that except only two: *viz. Beemus* and *Strabo*. That I have *perverted* the sayings of *all the Authors* throughout the *Centuries*.

Mr. Wills charge for Prevarication and Falshood.

But how he makes this *charge* appear, is now to be the *Question*. And therefore in order to the due *Examination* thereof, we shall join *issue* with him, and put it to the tryall, how and in what particulars he will make *good*, either the *Prevarications*, or *falshoods*, suggested by him.

First as to the *Prevarications*.

The *Prevarications* he mentions, must appear, either in the *Authorities* produced *before*, or *since* Infants *Baptisme* was enjoyn'd. 1. Prevarications.

First, as to those produced by me, *before* Infants Baptisme was imposed: *viz.* from the *four first Centuries*, It is manifest, that as to all the *Testimonies* I bring in the three first *Centuries*, so *positively* affirming, that Profession of *Faith* was to *precede* Baptisme: He gives no materiall Exception, only saith this of *Tertulian*, pag. 6. second part: *That the* Magdeburgs *tell us indeed, that* Tertullian *in this age, opposed himself to some, that Asserted Infants Baptisme, affirming that the Adult were the only proper Subjects. But how weakly he doth it, may be seen afterwards, when we come to examine the witnesses, of which* Tertullian *is the Van.*

So that I hope, it will be acknowledged, that here is no *Prevarication*, or perverting *evidence*, in these my first *Testimonies* in the three first *Centuries*; and where you will find there is more then seven times two. *Beatus* and *Strabo* being none of their number, so that if we should go no *further*, my first *Proposition* stands firme, that *Believers Baptisme* was the only *Baptisme* for near 300. years.) None in the 3. first Cent.

But to proceed, I perceive his great cry against me, is for the *Authorities* I produce out of the *fourth Century*; but how justly, will speedily appear.

I do indeed say, that it is manifest to me,

That Adult Baptisme only practised in the 4. Cent. appears.

from the *Evidence* the *Magdeburg's* give us herein: That it was the approved and universall practice of this Age, as well in the *Eastern*, as *Western Churches*, to Baptise upon *Profession* of Faith.

1. From the sayings of the Fathers.

And which is made good by a threefold *evidence*. First, from the sayings of the *Fathers*, and greatest men of this Century, both in *Africa*, *Asia* and *Europa*.

2. Decrees of Councels.

Secondly, from the *positive* Decrees of three Eminent *Councells* in this Age.

3. From the Children of Christians not Baptised till aged.

Thirdly, from the pregnant instances of ten of the most *eminent Men*, that were not *Baptised* till aged, though the Children of Christian Parents, in this Century.

First, from the *sayings* of the *Fathers*, both in the *East* and *West*.

Affrica.

First, that it doth not appear, that any other then *Adult Baptisme* was practised in the *Churches* of *Africa*, is manifest by the sayings of *Athanasius*, and *Arnobius*, two of the most eminent in those Parts, in this Age: Who do positively affirm, as appears by their saying, at large p. 55, 56. *That Teaching, Faith, and Desire should, according to Christ's Commission, precede Baptisme.* And to which we may add, what we have from *Optatus Milevitanus* an other Person of great Name in this Church, in this Age; who tell us in his 4. Book, as say the *Magdeburg's*, Century 4. pag. 237. *That none arrives; but that every Man by nature, though born of Christian Parents, is unclean, and that without the Spirit he is not cleansed, and that there is a necessity of the Spirits cleasing be-*

1. Athanasius.

2. Arnobius.

3. Optatus Milev.

fore

fore Baptisme: So that the house must be trim'd, and fitted for the Lord (viz. as he saith, *the Soul of the Believer is) that God may enter and dwell in it; according to the saying of the Apostle: You are the Temple of God, and he dwells in you.*

Secondly, that is was the Faith, and Practice of the *Churches* of *Asia*, appears by the like sayings, of *Basil. Greg. Nazienzen, Ephrim. Syrus, Epiphanius, &c.* as at large you have them p. 55, 56, 57. Asia.

Thirdly, that it was the universal practice in the *Western*, or *European* Churches, appears also from what is witnessed hereto, by *Hilary*, *Ambrose*, *Jerom*, and *Marius Victorinus*, in the foresaid Pages. And therefore do the *Magdeburg's*, upon *Hilary's* testimony, say, that the *Western Churches* did so observe it. And from *Jerom's* testimony, do also tell us, that it doth appear till his time, that the *Western Churches* did so continue, to Baptise the *Adult* upon Profession. (The Reader being desir'd, in both those Testimonies p. 55, 56. to put *Western* for *Eastern*. Europ.

Secondly, the truth of this further, appears from those Decrees of the three *Councels*: *viz.* The *Carthagenian* Council in *Affrica*; And the *Laodicean*, and *Neocesarean* Councels, *in Asia*; so positively *decreeing: That Teaching, Confession, Faith, and free Choice, ought to preceed Baptisme*, which you have in pag. 89. 2. Three Councels.

Thirdly, a third Argument, that *Adult* Baptisme was the only *approved* Baptisme of this Age, I *demonstrated* from those ten *Remarkable* Instances, of the most *eminent* men in this Century: 3. Children of Christians not Baptised.

that were not Baptised, though the Children of Christian Parents, till they were *able* to make *Profession* of their *Faith*, *viz. Constantin, Bazil, Greg. Nazienzen, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Jerom, Augustin, Nectarius, Valentinian*, and *Theodosius*.

Four of the 10 excepted against.

To the first ten *Testimonies* of the sayings of the Fathers, Mr. *Wills* except only against four, *viz. Athanasius. Basil, Ambrose*, and *Nazienzen*, because he saith, they are all of them expres for *Infants Baptisme*; and which are therefore perverted by me, because I bring them for *Believers* Baptisme *only*, who were for Infants Baptisme also.

To which I say, that if but four of the ten be excepted against, then we have six more stand good for us, besides the former (*viz.* 15. not excepted against) as perverted: But

The four Wit. vindicated. *Viz.* Basil. Athan. Naz. Ambrose.

Secondly, it cannot be *denyed*, but these four are very full in their Testimonies, for Adult Baptisme; only for *Basile* saith expresly, *Faith must needs precede, and that none else were to be Baptised, and what can be more full. Athanasius* as expres also as he, *for Teaching, and Faith from Christs Commission before Baptisme.* And *Nazianzen* as positive as either; *That they neither Baptised any of Old without Profession, and that it was dangerous then so to do, and therefore advised, that Infants Baptisme should be deferred, till they were capable to make some Confession.* And *Ambrose* as full also, That the *Baptised should not only make Confession, but desire the same.* Therefore if any of them should contrary hereto say, Infants should be Baptised, it would not only contradict the *acknowledged Rule*, the general *confessed practice* of the Age, but *them-*

selves

selves also in the aforesaid *Testimony* born by them.

But thirdly, neither doth it appear upon a due search, for ought I can yet find, that these four did so contradict themselves, in asserting Infants Baptisme, as affirmed. For

First, *Athanasius* is much injured in Fathering those Questions to *Antiochus* upon him, in the 114. and 124. whereof Infants Baptisme is asserted, it being a *forged*, and *spurious thing*, and none of his, as I shall make manifest presently by *undeniable* proof. Athan. not for Infants Baptisme;

Secondly, neither will it appear, that *Basil.* has any where asserted *Infants Baptisme*, as I shall fully *demonstrate* in it's place also, and Mr. *Wills* his egregious mistake about it. Nor Basil.

Thirdly, As for the *Testimony* that he produceth, that *Ambrose* was for Infants Baptisme, from that saying of his, lib. 2. de Ab. cap. 11. *Because every age is obnexious to sin, therefore every age first is fit for the Sacrament*, is no proof for the same; 1. Because Circumcision is there only meant, 2. If Baptised, then those of every age, that are fit for that Sacrament, must be supposed (as he before tells us.) *viz.* those only *that are capable to confess Faith and desire Baptisme*; otherwise (by this testimony as he would carry it) not only all *Children*, but all *Men*, and *Women* in the World, the *Bad* as well as the *Good*, the *Unbelievers* as well as the *Believer*, being all obnoxious to sin, are therefore esteemed the fit *subjects* of Baptisme. But suppose *Ambrose* was positive for Infants Baptisme, it is but the opinion of one Doctor, that contradicts himself too, and that Nor Ambrose.

against the judgement, and practise of the Age.

Fourthly, As for the testimony he urges from *Greg. Nazienzen*, which has the most in it, we shall duely *Examine*; He tells us pag. 11. that *Greg. Nazienzens* words are expres in the case, and makes manifest that he was *absolutely* for *Infants Baptisme*, in his 40. Oration, *viz. Hast thou a young Child let it be early consecrated, yea ἐκ βρέφους from its Infancy* (as Mr. *Wills* renders the word) *and therefore as in his* 3. *Oration they Baptised all ages, as he said.*

Nazian. not absolutely for Infants Baptisme.

To which I answer, that from his *translating* the word βρέφους Infants, to conclude him absolutely for *Infants Baptisme*, is to impose a *falacy* upon his Reader, when he knows the word signifies a state of *Childhood* also, that is capable of understanding, as it is taken 2 *Tim* 3 15. And *that from a Child thou hast known the Scriptures*, the word is, ἀπὸ βρέφους. and therefore *Nazienzen* must be understood by his early *Consecration*, to mean not in the *Cradle*, but as he explains himself, so soon as they are capable to know *Mysteries* except only in the case of danger of *death*; and which is to Baptise not so much a *Child* as a *dying* Person. And that he means not the *Infants state* is manifest, because in the same 40. *Oration* he hath these words (speaking of *those who decease without Baptisme:*) viz. *Neither can they Receive Baptisme, either perhaps by Reason of Infancy, or some altogether involentary, chance by which it is that even they who would, obtained not the gift.* Whereby it is manifest, that in his time *Infancy* was one of the *Obstacles* that hindred *Baptisme*,

tisme, and whereby Persons deceased without it. And therefore by that passage, in his third *Oration*, of all ages Receiving *Baptisme*, is to be understood, such only that are capable of *Instruction* in the *Faith*, and the *Mysteries* of that *Ordinance*, whether young *Men*, old *Men*, or *Fathers*, living before declared, is so dangerous to come unprepared to it. Therefore *Grigories* testimony, so much lean'd upon, to prove *Infants Baptisme* in this Century, signifies nothing. *And Doctor Barlow tells us that as Tertullian in the former Age condemn'd it, as an unwarrentable, and irrational Custom, so did* Nazienzen (*as he saith*) *dislike it too, and would not have them brought to Baptisme, till they were of some age, and able to answer for themselves, in his Oration* εἰς ἅγιον βάπτισμα.

But 'tis said, is it not manifest that in case of danger of death, he would have an *Infant Baptized*? It is true, but that was not *qua* Infant, but as a *dying Person*; and which was through a superstitious *conceit*, that *Baptisme* might save them; as some give the Eucharist, and Extream unction, when they are just departing. In like manner there was also in this Age an opinion, that some had to Baptise *Children*, to cure them of their *Bodily diseases*, Magd. Cent. 4. c. 6. p. 423. As they were grown Persons also in the next Age to cure them, *Aug.* to. 7. col. 89. *c*. But what are either of these to that *Ordinance of Baptisme*? *Tertullian* that, as Doctor *Barlow* tells us, was so great an opposer of *Infants Baptisme*, as *irrational*, and *unwarrentable*, yet had this fancy of Baptizing a *dying Child*, to save it; which signifies just nothing to the thing

Objection.

Answer.

Sick Persons Baptised for cure.

pleaded for, and that Persons may as well bring *Protogenes* for an Authority, that pretended to Baptize the sick Children of this Age to cure their *deceases*; as *Gregorie*, and *Tertulian* for Baptizing of dying Children, to save their Souls.

So that all our instances from the sayings of our *Eminent* Men, stands as yet firme for us, notwithstanding what Mr. *Wills*, has said to the contrary.

Secondly, as to the *Decrees* of the three *Councels*, he saith this: *That if it must go by the number of Councels, they shall carry it; for if I name three, that must be supposed to be against Infants Baptisme, he thinks he should not exceed, if he should, he could name ten times three for it.* Besides he conceives, *that those three Councels mentioned by me, had respect only to Pagans, in those their Decrees, from what Mr.* Marshall *had said in answer to that of Neocesaria.*

His exceptions against the Councels very frivolous.

To his first answer, I say, it is *granted* I think (as I have made it ready to his hand;) he may quote the *Canons* of thirty *Councels*, for Infants Baptisme, in the following ages (and a stout argument, no doubt for it.) But what are such *Decrees* to this *fourth Century*, wherein I produce three for Believers Baptisme, upon *Profession* and *free choice*; and he not one in this time (as indeed it is impossible he should) there being none found to ordain any *such thing*, till after this Century.

And as to his conception, that the *Neocesarian* Councel means *only Pagans*, and not the *Children* of *Christian Women*, *as he saith*, *Mr.* Marshal *hath made appear*; *and therefore in his usuall civility tells* me,

me, how impudent it is in me to trouble us with this silly Ridiculous story.

He must therefore know, that he and *Mr. Marshal*, both do miss the Case, the stress of the Decree lyes not about the Parent, but for the Exclusion of all Children, whether of *Pagan*, or *Christian* Parents; because confession, and free choice is required in that Sacrament. And therefore saith *Grotius* from the *Glossers*, *That an Infant cannot be Baptised, because it hath no power to confess, or choose the Divine Baptisme.* And which *strake reason, saith Doctor* Tayler, *and intimates a practice which was absolutely universal in the Church, of interrogating the Catechumens, concerning the Articles of their Creed, which is one Argument saith he, that either they did not admit Infants to Baptisme, or that they did prevaricate egregiously, in asking Questions of them, who themselves know, were uncapable of giving answers.*

So that we have as little *prevaricated* in our *Councels*, as in our *Fathers*.

Thirdly, the next exception he makes, is against the *Instances* of those eminent Men not Baptised till aged, and of the ten before mentioned, he gives in exceptions only against four, *viz. Constantin*, *Nazienzen*, *Chrysostome*, and *Austin*. Excepts against 4. of the 10. not Baptised in their Infancy.

By which we have gained, *six* other unperverted *Authorities* more; and surely it is of much weight, that if six such eminent *Persons*, the Children of *Christian Parents* were not Baptised, till they could make a *Confession* of their Faith; it is a substantial *Argument*, that Believers Baptisme

tisme was the Baptisme generally *owned* in this Age, and that Infants Baptisme was not yet received as an *Apostolical Tradition*, and ordinance of Christ, whilst so many Renowned worthyes of this Age, the Parents of these great Men, should neglect to Baptize them in their *Infancy*, for the Argument lyes *there*, and not as Mr. *Wills* so weakly reasons, from some *misapprehensions* in the *parties themselves*, as in p. 17.

Constant. the Son of Christians Parents, as Dailly. Magd.

But as to the Exceptions themselves: First, as to *Constantin*, if he, and Mr. *Marshal* doubt whether *Constantin* had Godly *Parents* at his birth; As good *Historians*, as they do not. As *Grotius* and *Dailly* witnessing to *Helana's* Christianity before his birth, as p. 60. & 62. And the *Magdeburgs* to that of his Father, Cent. 4. p. 61. Out of *Eusebius* in these words, *Constantinus Constantii Imperatoris Filii, honus a bono, pius a pio. Constantine the son of Constantius, a good man from a good, a holy man from a holy one.*

Nazian. the Son of Christians Parents, as Magd.

As to that of *Nazienzen*, I wonder Mr. *Wills* should cavil about him, seeing he knows the *Magdeburgs*, in the Account they give of his life, tell us from such undeniable *Authority*: That *his Father Gregorius was a pious Bishop, and his Mother Nonna a gracious holy Woman before his Birth, and that she by prayer obtained this her son of God, and how from his youth he did patrizare & matristatim a puero Paternis moribus imbutus est.* Mag. Cent. 4. pag. 934. &c. Besides in confirmation thereof, Doctor *Hall* (as Mr. *Tombes* tell us) in his Honour to his married Clergy, 2 Book 8. Sect. saith: *That* Nazienzen *was begotten of his Father being*

Dr. Halls.

being a Bishop, and to prove it, brings his Fathers words, speaking to him to perswade him to help him in his charge, which he translates out of the Greek: *viz.* **The years of thy age, are not so many as of my Priesthood,** confirming what was said above out of the *Magdeburgs.*

As for *Chrysostome* he saith: *Mr.* Marshal saith, *it is uncertain, whether Father and Mother were Christians at his birth.* But as for that we will let it rest upon *Grotius's testimony*, as you have it p. 61. whom none can think a *partiall* Author in this Case, being so firmly for Infants Baptisme, and without dispute so well read in Antiquity. Chrisost. Christian Parents, as Grotius.

And as for *Austin* I will recommend you to two instances, to make it good, and clear Mr. *Wills* doubts: The one is Doctor *Tayler*; not in his Liberty of Prophecy (which *is excepted* against by Mr. *Wills*, but how warrentably we shall hereafter examine) but in one of his last pieces, *viz.* in his Deswasive against Popery, printed 1667. *where you have him in* Sect. 3. p. 117. *thus expressing himself:* viz. *That there is no pretence of Tradition, that the Church in all ages did Baptize all the Infants of Christian Parents: it is more certain that they did not do it, then that they did: in the first Age St.* Ambrose, *St.* Jerom, *and St.* Austin, *were born of Christian Parents, and yet not Baptised until the full age of a man: and more that the Apostles did Baptize any Children, is not at all reported by any credible Tradition.* Austin Christian Parents, as Dr. Tayler.

The other is Mr. *Baxter*, an evidence that in this Case is not to be rejected, who is pleased to tell us in a very late piece, *viz.* his Principles of Love p. 7. Mr. Baxter.

That

That he knew that in the days of Tertullian, Nazienzen, *and* Austin, *men had liberty to be Baptised, or to bring their Children, when and at what age they pleased, and that none were forced to go against their consciences therein. And that he knew not that our Rule or Religion is changed, or that we are grown any wiser or better than they. And again* Christian Direct. p. 327. *Thus*

That ancient Christians had liberty to let their Children stay till age, as they thought best. And that Austin, *and many Children of Christian Parents were Baptised at age.*

Dr. Barlow. And upon the whole, we may add what *Doctor Barlow* saith to this purpose, pag. 64. I am sure *that in the Primative times they were Catechumeni, then illuminati or Baptizati; and that not only Pagans, and Children of Pagans converted, but Children of Christian Parents also.*

Thus we have gone through our first *four Centuries*, and the *proofs* urged to this point of *History* from them; and therein I hope the Reader will fully acquit me, from that charge of *Prevarication*, in perverting the Authorities brought by me to *witness*, that in these times *Confession*, and *Profession* of *Faith*, was held necessary to *precede Baptisme.*

That only the Adult Baptised in the first ages confirmed by Divers. And that I am not mistaken, nor alone in my *apprehension* herein, I shall repeat a few, both of the *Ancient* and *Modern* Writers, that have so fully confirmed the truth hereof, *affirming* with much *positiveness, that* [*only*] the *Adults*, upon *Confession of Faith*, *were the Subjects of Baptisme in these first times.*

Wala-

Walafrid Strabo in Rebus Eccles. p. 26. *That in the first times the grace of Baptisme was wont to be given, to them* Only, *who were come to that integrity of mind and body, that they could know and understand, what profit was to be gotten by Baptisme, what was to be confessed, and believed, and lastly, what was to be observed by them that are new born in Christ.* Strabo.

Beatus Rhenanus in Anotat. sup. Tertull. *saith: That the old custom was, that they that were come to their full growth, were Baptised with the Bath of Regeneration; which custom he said continued for some of the first Ages.* Rhenanus.

Rupertus in his 4. Book of Divine Offices cap. 18. *saith: That in former times the custom of the primative Churches was, that they administred not the Sacrament of Regeneration, but* Only *to the Catechumens, who were instructed in the Rules of Faith, Rehearsing the same.* Rupertus.

Jo. Boemus Lib. 2. de Gent. Mor. *It was in times past (saith he) the Custom to administer Baptisme,* Only, *to those that were instructed in the Faith, &c.* Boemus.

Doctor *Hamond* in his Cat. lib. 1. c. 3. p. 23. *saith: That All Men were instructed in the Fundamentals of Faith anciently, before they were permitted to be Baptised.* Dr. Hamond.

Mr. *Baxter* in his Saints Rest. part. 1. cap. 8. Sect. 5. *saith: That* Tertullian, Origen, *and* Cyprian, *who lived in the 2. and 3. Centuries, do all of them affirm, that in the primative times* None were Baptized, *without an express covenanting, wherein they renounced the World, Flesh, and* Mr. Baxter.

and Devel; and ingaged themselves, and promised to obey him.

The Testimonies for Adult Baptisme, after Infants Baptisme was enjoined.

In the next place, for further *confirmation* of this truth, I gave you in some *Testimony* that was born thereto, after *Infants Baptisme* was established, in the *sixth Century*; and that not only from those that denyed *Infants Baptisme*, but from those that owned and *practised* it; *Papists* and *others*, through the rest of the Centuries.

1. From particular Persons, 1. that denyed Infants Baptisme.

Of the first I produced several *Eminent men*, as particular witnesses, some of which I shall mention, *viz.*

Crescon. *Crescenius* pag. 230. *who said that there was no true Baptisme, but such as was administred after Faith.*

Faustus. *Faustus Regienses*, pag. 230. *That personal and actual desire was requisite, in every one that was to be Baptised.*

Albanus. *Albanus, who was put to death for his witness hereto*, p. 230.

The Swermers *These eminent People, called* Swermers, *in the sixth Century: That from Christ Example of Baptisme reproved, the evil custom of Infants Baptisme*, p. 231,

Bishop of Apamen, *The Bishop of Apamen, and Zoroarat, who did defend the* Baptisme *of* Believers *to be the only Baptisme*, pag. 231.

Adrianus. *Adrianus* Bishop *of Corinth in the 7. Century, who did stoutly defend* Believers Baptisme, *not permitting an Infant to be* Baptised *in his Diocese*, page 231.

Hincmar. *Hincmarus*, Bishop *of Laudum, refusing Infants* Baptised, *only* Believers, 235.

The

The Egyptian Divines, *in the seventh Century, taught Faith before Baptisme, in opposition to the Romish Baptisme, p. 232.* Egyptian Divines.

Carolus, *Bishop of Maylant, taught that only such as were instructed and confessed Faith, and manifested a holy life, were to be baptised.* Carolus.

Jacob de Roor, *owned only, that Baptisme that Christ commanded after teaching and believing; and which the Apostles did also practise; and which, saith he, must needs be after believing, because it is for the burying of sin, the Bath of Regeneration, the Covenant of a Christian life, and the puting on the Body of Christ, and planting into the true Olive-tree Jesus Christ, and for the right entrance into the Spiritual Ark &c.* Jacob de Roor.

Besides many others I *forbear* to *mention*, but refer you to the Book it self; And which I suppose are all *full*, *proper*, and *pertinent* witnesses in the case, and against none of which he makes any *exception*, and which I hope you will add to all the rest, besides the two he will please to allow me.

2. The Churches that denyed Infants Baptisme, witnessing for Believers only.

I do also bring into this evidence, besides many particular Persons, an Account of several *Churches*, that have in their Principles, and Practises, confirmed this of Believers Baptisme, after profession of Faith, and which are as followeth.

The Donatists *that taught that none should be baptised, but those that believed, and desired the same, p. 222.* 1. Donatists.

The Waldenses *that taught, that by Baptisme the Believers were Received into the holy Congrega-* 2. Waldenses.

sion, there professing, and declaring openly their Faith, and amendment of life, p. 239.

3. Germans. *The Churches of Christ in* Germany *owned, and contended for this Faith, and practise; and many sealed the same with their blood*, p. 157.

4. Helvetians. *The Churches in* Helvetia *asserted the same, and many suffred Bonds, and Martyrdom from Protestant Brethren, for the profession thereof*, p. 260.

5. Thessalonians. *The Churches in* Thessalonica *of the same Faith, and practise*, p. 76.

6. Flemings. *The Churches of Christ in* Flanders *asserting the same, and multitude of Martyrs that witnessed thereto by blood*, p. 267. &c.

7. Bohemians. *The Churches in* Bohemia *witnessing to this truth, and their great sufferings for the same*, pag. 271.

8. Hungarians. *The Churches of* Hungaria *of the same practice*, p. 274.

9. Poles. *The Churches in* Poland *of like Faith, and practise*, p. 274.

10. Transilvanians. *The Churches in* Transylvania *of the same practice*, 274.

11. English. *The Churches in this Nation owning the same Principle, and practise*; viz.

First, In the time of the ancient Britains, p. 226.

Secondly, Under the name of Lollards *from the* Waldensian *Barbe of that Name*, pag. 278. p. 203, 204.

Thirdly, Under the name Wickliffians, *who asserted also that Believers were the only Subjects of Baptisme*, p. 283.

And Lastly, *Since* Henry *the* Eight's *time, under the name of* Anabaptists, p. 306.

Against

Against which latter testimony, from these respective Churches in these several Regions, he only excepts against the *Donatists*, *Waldenses*, and ancient *Britains*, denying that they were of this Faith and practise, which you have particularly replyed to in the third Chapter, where the witnesses against Infants Baptisme are defended.

But in the mean time it must be remembred, that the rest stand good, as *not excepted against*.

Secondly, you have the *Testimony*, born to this truth by many Eminent Men, and Churches, that have owned, and practised Infants Baptisme, since the imposing thereof; some of whom are these that follow, as you find them in the respective Centuries; *viz. Chrysostom*, *Austin*, *Gregory*, *Cassiodorus*, *Haimo*, *Rabanus*, *Anselm*, *Algerus*, *Rupertus*, *Lumbard*, *Albertus*, *Belarmine*, *Grotius*, *Luther*, *Calvin*, *Hamond*, *Daille*, *Taylor*, *Baxter*, *Church of England*. All or most of them affirming with the Church of *England*, that Faith and Repentance is required in all those that are to be *Baptised*, *viz.* Repentance whereby *they forsake sin*, *and* Faith *whereby they steadfastly believe the Promises*.

2. The witness born to Baptisme after Faith, by those that owned Infants Baptisme.

To all which *Testimony* Mr. *Wills especially* quarrels me, for perverting, as he saith, their sayings, against there *intended* sences, by improving what they say for *Adult* Baptisme (wherein they meant *only Strangers*, and *Pagans* converted to the Faith) against Infants Baptisme, which is in an *other way*, and upon an *other Account*. And for being so notoriously contradictious to my self, in saying they are for *Believers* Baptisme in one

Mr. Wills exceptions against this part of the Testimony.

part of the *History*, and yet the same Men, and *Councels*, for Infants Baptisme in an other.

Replyed to. To which I say, that by Quoting their sayings, that are so expresly for us, though it may be not *intended* so; I have done no injury.

1. Not quoted for Anabaptist. First, because I do not quote them as *Anabaptists*, or to prove that Believers Baptisme was the *only Baptisme* of those Centuries (that would have been madness, and contradiction with a witness, and which he seems to father upon me.

2. But Argumenta ad hominem. Secondly, because nothing is more fair or frequent, then to improve mens own *sayings* against themselves, for their better conviction and clearing the truth; as Mr. *Tombes* has brought Mr. *Baxters* 20. Arguments against *himself*, and therefore called his Book *Felo de se*; and no more injury done thereby, then Mr. *Tombes* saith, was done by Bishop *Morton*, in alledging the *Romanists* words in there *writings*. *as an Advocate for the Protestants against themselves, but right done thereby. as he saith, to the Church of God.* So that what they say respecting the *Commission*, for the necessity of *teaching*, *profession*, and *confession*, and so as their *words* necessarely exclude any other but such *capable* Subjects, what injury to improve it for the truth (and to which I have spoken much to prevent *Cavils* of this kind, as you'l find it p. 85, 86, and in the *Preface*)

Austin for Adult Baptisme, in words as to exclude Infants. For instance, *If Austin* tells us in one place, *That none without due Examination both to Doctrine and Conversation, ought to be Baptised, and that no ignorant or scandelous Person, without due instruction, and fruits of Repentance, are to be admit-*

tet

ded to Baptisme, what can be spoken more agreeable to truth; and more indeed to assert *Believers* Baptisme, to be the only Baptisme, and to exclude any other that are not capable to act Faith, or testefy fruits; for if no other, as he saith, then not Infants.

How weakly & contradictiously Austin asserts Infants Baptisme.

Yet the same *Austin* in contradiction hereto saith, *Let Infants be baptised by the Faith of another, to take away Original sin, without which they can neither be Regenerated or saved.* Now, compare these two together, what *sound Christian* will not say, that *Austin* before spoke the mind of *Christ*, in wholesome sound *word?* and herein his own words, if not corrupt and heretical; *For as one well observes that such Doctrine as this, was the greatest poyson, that ever the Father of Lyes powred into the hearts of Sinners*; to make People think, that sprinkling a little water on the face could Regenerate, take away sin, and save the Soul, and beget grace *ex opero operato* by the work done.

2. Calvin for Believers Baptisme by Rule.

Calvin *in one place tells us, the due and right order of Baptisme from the Commission, saying thus*, viz. *That Men may rightly offer themselves, to Baptisme; Confession of sins is required, otherwise the whole action would be nothing else but sport.*

Calvin for Infants Baptisme, in contradiction hereto, without Rule.

Yet in another place in contradiction hereto saith: *Let the Children of Believers be baptised, because God having taken their Parents into Covenant, they themselves are also to be imbraced in the same Covenant; Neither is Baptisme hereby separated from Faith and teaching, because though Children have not yet Faith, nor are capable of teaching, yet their Parents have both*

But by what *Rule* or *Reason* this latter is urged, and how possibly to be Reconciled with the former, so agreeable to *both*, is the knot to be untyed.

3. Mr. Baxter for Beleivers Baptisme, by precept & Example.

So also Mr. *Baxter* upon Christ Commission, *Matth.* 28, 20. This saith he, *sheweth the Disciples their several works in their several Orders*; viz. *First, to make Disciples, which Mark calls Beleivers. Secondly, is to Baptize them, whereto is annexed the promise of Salvation. Thirdly, to teach them all other things, which are after to be learned in the School of Christ: And that to contemn this order, is to contemn all Rules of Order; professing his conscience is fully satisfied from this Text, that it is no sort of Faith even saving, that must go before Baptisme, the Profession whereof the Minister must expect*, as pag. 3. *And again, if there can be no Example given in Scripture, of any one that was baptised without the Profession of saving Faith, nor any precept for so doing, then we must not baptize any without it. But the Antecedent is true, saith he, from the practice of all baptised in Scripture, which he particularly enumerates, and then saith, so is the consequence.*

What can be said more consonant to truth, more agreable to the *Scriptures*, and what more in *justification* to the Baptisme of *Beleivers*, and to the Excluding all others uncapable of Profession.

Mr. Baxter for Infants Baptisme, without Precept or Example.

And yet the same Mr. *Baxter* tells us, that an Infant is to be Baptised: but by what Rule? Why, saith he, upon the Account of his Parents Faith? But where is that to be found in the *Precept*

cept? Is it baptize the believing *Parent* and his Child? is that found in the order of the *Commission*, or is a Child to be found in all the *pregnant* Examples, in the New Testament, that he hath given us?

When Mr. *Baxter*, or any one in his behalf, can reconcile Mr. *Baxter* to Mr. *Baxter*, *Austin* to *Austin*, *Calvin* to *Calvin*, I shall own my mistake herein, till then must believe, that it is good service, to improve their *contradictions* to *themselves*, and for the service of that *truth*, that they so vigorously oppose.

But thirdly, there is no injury done to them in the sence, that most of the Doctors, both *Papists* and *Protestants*, have given us themselves, respecting those *expressions*, about the necessity of *Repentance* and *Faith*, before *Baptisme*, and how they reconcile them to Infants *Baptisme*. And which we have so fully done to our hand, in the *English* Liturgy, that will put it out of *doubt*. You know it is there expresly told *us*, that *Faith* and *Repentance* is required, in all that are to be *baptised*. [*good and sound Doctrine.*] But then the Question, you know, is put: *How do Infants*, who by reason of their tender age cannot perform them? *viz.* can neither Repent nor Believe, [*sound Doctrine still.*] To which they answer, *Yes*; they do perform them by their sureties; So that we are to understand, that though Infants cannot Repent nor *Believe*, which yet is so necessarly *required* in every one that is to be *baptised*, yet that others may *undertake* for them, answer the *Commission* for them, *Repent*, *Believe*.

3. Reply. No injury done them from their own expositions of their sayings.

Confess for them, and declare a *willingness* in their name to be baptised; and this is actually *done* by the *sureties*, as our English *Liturgy* directs (and every dayes experience tells us in the Christning of Children) which interpretes to us, the *ancient* way of *Interrogating* Sponcers, and which is performed after this manner: *viz.* The *Priest* saith to the surety, *Doest thou forsake the Devil, and all his works, &c.* Then the surety must answer, *I forsake them all.* Priest, Then, *Doest thou believe in God the Father*, rehearsing *the Creed* S. To which he is to answer, *All this I stedfastly believe.* P. then, *Will thou be baptised into this Faith?* *Yes*, saith the Surety in the name of the Child, *that is my desire.* This was the Custom of old, and with Infants Baptisme established, (though *it is true they had Sureties, or Witnesses, for grown Persons before Infants Baptisme was enjoyned.*) Yet now because the Commission required Faith and Repentance, therefore was this *invention* found out to answer it. And therefore saith *Lud. Vives* in his Comment. l. 1. c. 27. *That none were baptised of old, but those of age, who did not only understand what the water meant, but desired the same*

How by Sureties Infants do confess & profess Faith and Repentance, and so capable of Baptisme.

The perfect Image whereof, saith he, we have yet in our Infants Baptisme; for it is asked of the Infant, will thou be baptised? for whom the Sureties answer, I will; And so saith Strabo *pag* 60. *and* Jo. Boemus *p* 73.

Lud. Vives why sureties invented for Infants.

Magdeburg Century 5. p. 516. *Infantes aliena Fide baptizari: Infants are to be baptised by the Faith of another.*

There-

Therefore called *Fidejussors*, or *Sureties*, that plight Faith for them; and *Sponsors*, that answer for them; *Susceptors*, that undertake Promise, Vow, and Renownce for them.

So that this appears, to be the *untying* the *knot*, the *Reconciling* of the seeming difficulty, of the necessity of *Confession*, *consent*, and *desire* with *Infants Baptisme*, so making the *Commission* but one general Rule, to baptise both *Adult* and *Infants*, the Adult by his own Mouth and Faith, the Infant by the Mouth and Faith of another. Therefore all these sayings of these latter *Doctors*, and learned *Men*, speaking to the nature of *Baptisme*; wherein *Confession* and *Profession* is required, is to be understood, not as Mr. *Wills* would have it, to intend only *Adult Persons*, *Pagans*, and *Heathens*, but to intend *Infants* also; otherwise it would be to make two Baptismes, and necessitate two *Commissions*: one for the *Adult*, and the other for *Infants*. But in as much, as none is to be found for the latter, they include and involue all in the former.

Therefore by my producing, these proofs from all the *Padobaptists*, as the true sence of the *Commission*, and a general *Rule* to baptise upon, it will be manifest, that I do not bring them contrary to the *mind* of the Writers, being urged to *confirm* and establish *Believers* Baptisme, according to Christs *Commission*. The *Lutherans* are positive, that Children have *actual Faith*, and in Baptisme hear the *Word*, *use Reason*, *&c.* And all the rest, that others Repent, Believe, Profess, Confess, desire for them, *viz.* either the Surety, or the Parent. But

Objection. But 'tis said, you carry it further, and *improve* their general Rule for Believers Baptisme, against *Infants Baptisme*, contrary to their intention, because they intend Infants not otherwise to be baptised, but as professed Believers in this way.

Answer. To which I say, that it truly serves the *Intention*, wherefore it is brought under this *Head*, where we do not so *immediately* concern our selves against *Infants*, which is an *other part*, but for Believers *only*; though I grant consequentially it doth so, for if a personal Professing of *Faith*, be only *intended* in the Commission, and that no such thing as a surety is to be *found* in that Text, or any other, to profess or confess, for an other, so as to warrant, the party confess'd for, to be a proper subject of Baptisme.

Then it will follow, that all those sayings, make *only for Believers* in their own *Persons*, to the excluding all that are uncapable of Personal *Confession* and *Profession*: When any such thing as a surety in Baptisme, *to believe*, *repent* and *confess* for an other is made out from Scripture, they may have Reason to complain, but till then, no injury is done, so to clear the truth, from their own *grants* and sayings. But that there is no such thing in the Scripture, take the acknowledgement of some of their own party.

Magd. against sureties. The *Magdeburgs* Century 1. p. 497. *Do tell us, that God-Fathers, or Fidejussors* for Infants, *or others, they find nothing of in the Scriptures; that in the second of the Acts they offred themselves to Baptisme. & that it would be very ridiculous to think the Apostles would baptise none without Sureties.*

And

And Doctor *Taylor* pag. 84. *I know, saith he, God might if he would have appointed God-Fathers, to give answer in the behalf of Children, and to be Fidejussors for them, but we cannot find any Authority or Ground, that he hath; and if he had, that it is to be supposed he would have given them Commission, to have transacted the solemnity with better circumstances, and have given answers with more truth; for the Question is askt of Believing in the present, and if the God-Father answer, in the name of the Child, I do believe, it is notorious, they speak false and ridiculous, for the Infant is not capable of Believing, and if it were, he were also capable of dissenting, and how then do they know his mind? and therefore, saith he,* Tertullian *and* Gregory Nazienzen *gave advice, that the Baptism of Infants shall be deferred, till they could give an account of their own Faith.* If you would be further satisfied about these Sureties or Gossips, why and for what use, *viz.* for Bells and Churches, and grown Persons as Infants, read pag. 84. 100. 128, 129, and 141. Dr. Taylor against sureties, and his Reasons.

But if you will not *admit* of God-Fathers, what do you say to *Fathers?* why may not they *Repent*, and *Believe* for the *Child*, and so answer the *Commission*, especially being a believing Parent, and in Covenant, according to what Mr. *Wills* repeates from Mr. *Calvin?* p. 2. Object.

To which I say, that if you betake to that, you quit all your Antient Authorities, that depend upon *sureties*. where the Parent is expressly *forbidden* that Rite, none being permitted to undertake for his Child, neither Father nor Answer.

Mo-

Mother, as *Vincentius* tells us at large, from the Decrees of the Councels, ch. 33. p. 92. Mr. *Baxter* owning it against the Canon-Law also. Neither will you find one *syllable* in all the New *Testament*, to relieve you; and therefore must either find out a New *Commission*, for baptizing Persons without personal *Repentance*, *& Faith*, or *renounce*, the practice of sprinkling Infants, that are so uncapable to do any thing *thereof*. And which case you have very fully, and honestly put by Master *Baxter*, in his Christian Directory pag. 817. And how well resolved you have it remark, pag. 217. and worthy of your perusal, upon this point especially; it being brought herein, into such a *narrow* compass, for if no Scripture *ground* to baptize an Infant, by a *Gossip or Parents* Faith and *Confession*, then Infants Baptisme is certainly a *nullity*, and out of doors by their own *grants*. And therefore till Mr. *Baxter*, or some Body else, *give* us a better solution in that case of *Conscience*, we may say in his own words: That for Persons to be baptised without a *profest'd Contract* is a Baptisme not of Christs appointment; and that being done without Repentance and Faith, is a prophanation saith Mr. *Baxter*, and ridiculous saith *Calvin*.

Now, therefore upon the whole, let the Reader judge, whether my severall proofs are not *full*, *proper*, and *pertinent*; And whether Mr. *Wills* upon the closing of his seventh Chapter, respecting my proofs upon the Centuries, hath spoken like a judicious, *sober*, *considerate* Person; in saying:

That

That besides Jo. Boemus *and* Strabo, *he may truly say, that from the beginning of the Century to the end, this* Unfaithful Man *hath perverted the sayings of all Authors, which he hath quoted, and upon consideration of his carriage herein, I am confident of these two things:*

First, that never any Writer did more prevaricate, and shew more Falshood then he hath done.

Secondly, that he would certainly have forborn, if he had thought any man would have been at the trouble, to examine and search whether he saith truth or no.

I say, *it is referred to judgement*, whether any sober man can judge, Mr. *Wills* has read the Book he so *contemns*, vehemently *aspersit*, and inveighs egainst: Or *secondly*, if he hath, whether he did consider what was either writen by the Author, or by himself in answer? And *thirdly*, If so, whether he *ought not to be* esteemed a *Person* extreamly void of *Reason* or *Conscience*, and that prejudice did more prevail with him then impartial *judgement?* My Appeal upon the proofs and the Prevarication charged.

Secondly, concerning the Falshoods he charges me with. 2. The Falshoods.

BUt in the next place, if it be supposed, the Authorities aforesaid are full and proper, and that I am acquit of the *Prevarications*; yet what do I say to so many Falshoods charged upon me, *in the egregious abuse put upon so many Authors, in leaving out, and curtailing some of their sayings, and adding to others; pretending they*

say

ſay, that which they do not, and ſo making Authorities of my own, the chapter and page being ſo punctually given in againſt me.

Anſwer 1. To which I ſay, Firſt, it ſeems to carry much *weight in it*, and the rather, becauſe it proceeds from one that profeſſes himſelf, a ſolid *grave* Perſon, a *Miniſter* of the Goſpel, and *Maſter of Arts*, and a *learned man*; and one that beſides hath ſpent ſo much time *lately*, as he tells us, in the *Univerſity Library at Oxford*, to trace theſe *Quotations* and to detect their *errors*, & deliver'd them with ſo much *certainty*, that nothing (as in that confident boaſt he expreſſeth it) but an Index *Expurgatorius* can *Relieve* me, and which is not to be had in *England*.

2. And ſecondly, I muſt needs grant, that if I acquit not my ſelf *herein*, I may very well be eſteemed, the unworthy Perſon that he would indeed render me to be, that is *guilty* of ſo much *Prevarication*, *Forgery*, and *Falſhood*.

3. But then thirdly, I hope it will be granted on the other hand, that if all theſe *proove forgeries* of his own, and no truth in any one of *them*, that then ſuch a *Stratagem* beſpeaks no leſs *malignity* to my Perſon, then to the truth *witneſſed* by me, and that he hath juſtly *contracted* to himſelf, the *Odium*, and infamy he would *Reflect* upon me, according to the equal deciſion, given us in the Caſe, *Deut.* 19. 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21. *Prov.* 19. 15.

Therefore to the *Examination* of the charge, I freely joyn iſſue with him, in order to the *ſpeedy trial*, at whoſe door the Falſhoods lye; for one

of

of us (it must be agreed on all hands) is notoriously guilty, and so we shall *proceed* to the *particulars*, as we find them in order.

The first whereof he thus begins with, in his Preface, &c. *He hath much injured the famous History of the Magdeburgenses, in very many places, by misrepresenting what they say: As that they tell us, that in the first Century* **the Apostles Baptized only the aged**, *which (saith he) is false, for he himself added the word* **Only**, *as is shown (he saith) ch. 7. part 1. p. 2. Where he again repeats it, saying, that the* Magdeburgs *in Century 1. l. 2. c. 6. p. 496. do not say,* **that the Apostles Baptized only the Adult.** And again in his pag. 38. *mentioning my Repetition of that aforesaid saying, of the* Magdeburgs *gives the following return.* 1. Falshood charged. 3. Falshood charged.

Very good Sir, Now you have learned to set down things right, but why did you say in the 56. (of the first Impressions) that the Magdeburgenses as to the Subjects of Baptisme tell us [**That in this age they only Baptized the Adult**] *was this, saith he, Lapsus calami aut mentis: The slip of the tongue, or the mind.*

To which I say, that it is most manifest, that this injurious man doth charge a *Falshood*, of his own making, upon me three *several* times; for he can find no such *words* in my Book. My *words* are expresly thus: *viz.* „ *As to the Subjects of* „ *Baptisme they*, viz. *the Magdeburgs tell us: That* „ *in this Age* [**they finde**] *they baptised only the A-* „ *dult, or Aged, &c.* I do not say, that they tell us, that in this Age they [*baptised only the Adult*] 1. Answered.

Adults] these are his words. But that they tell us, they find *they baptised only the Adults*, for so they tell us, they find *Examples* for the *one*, not for the *other*. And if I have not guessed right, let any sober Man in his senses judge, they tell us in these words: *Baptizatos esse Adultos, tum Judæos, tum Gentes exempla probant*, Act. 2. 8. 10, 16, 19. *De Infantibus Baptizatis quidem ista non leguntur*: That Examples testify (from the aforesaid Scriptures) that the *Adults*, *Jews*, and *Gentiles* were baptised; But of the baptizing of *Infants*, they read not of one Example upon Record. So that if they find many Examples for the one, and none for the other, well it may be said, they find Examples, *only* for the one, *viz.* for the *Adults*. 2. Answ. For they are not my Translation of the words (and therefore I add not the word [Only] to them, as he falsly suggested) but my sence upon those their words, and no other then I presume every one will give. And wherein his shameful (Dissimulancy, as he calls it, or) heedlessness is the more to be remarked, for he himself in his first words of the 7. chap. 1. part. doth repeat my words, as I express them, *viz.* [*that they find only the Adult or Aged, whether Jews or Gentiles, baptised in the Century.*] And afterwards charges me three time over with the saying an other thing, *aggravating* it with many agrivating *circumstances*, and as worthy of the greatest observation, puts it in the Van of the *Falshoods*. And it was one of the first things that I met with, from a *Friend* that was in his Book-sellers *Shop*, where some *Mi-*

nisters

misters were heard to say, upon the *reading* thereof, that I wanted *morallity*, in so dealing with Authors; Though truly if I had said the word, I do no know where such a hainous *crime* had *lain*. So that this is plain to you, that first I neither said *those* words, Nor secondly, did I add the word only *to the Author*.

In the next place, in his Preface he tells us, of two other *misrepresentations*; viz. *That I say, the* Magdeburgs *tell us, that the Custom of dipping the whole Body in water, was changed into sprinkling a little water in the face, in the first Century. Whereas there is not* (as he saith) *the least hint of this matter in this Century, nor the following; but the contrary. for they tell us, as* pag. 4. part. 1. *the word* βαπτίζω, *signifies abluo, luo*: viz. *to wash; and that the Christian Baptisme, was taken from the Jewish washings, of which the Apostle speaks* Heb. 9. 10. *divers Baptismes*. And *so saith he, the Author fathers that upon the Century Writers, which they speaks not.*

Wherein these two Falshoods are charged upon me: First, in bringing the *Magdeburgs*, to assert the Ceremony of *Baptisme* to be by dipping, which they do not, but the contrary. 3. Falshood charged.

Secondly, In *affirming* that they say, the *rite* was *changed* in that Century, from *dipping* to *sprinkling*, when *there is not the least hint, either in this, or the following Century, of any such thing*. 4. Falshood charged.

To the first (that I am not mistaken, when I tell you) that they do assert the Rite of Baptizing to be by dipping, let their own words determine (the substance whereof I before gave 3. Answer.

you) who having told us, *viz.* the Magdeburg Century 1. chap. 6. p. 148. *That as to the place of Baptiſme, it was, as occaſion was offred, in Rivers and Fountains, &c. And that the manner of it, was by dipping in theſe words:* viz. *Miniſtrum Baptiſmi in aquam baptizandos immerſiſſe, ſeu lavaſſe, in nomine Patri, & Filii, & Spiritus Sancti, probat verbum βαπτίζω, quod immerſionem in aquam ſignificat, & quod* Paulus *immerſionem illam allegorice de mortificatione & reſurrectione exponit,* Rom. 6. Col. 2. *Et Phraſes ille quibus Baptiſmus Lavacrum dicitur,* Eph. 5 & Titus 3. *Et quod* Ananias *jubet* Paulum *abluere peccatum,* Act. 22. *&c.*

That the word βαπτίζω, ſignifying an Immerſion, (or dipping) in water, proves that the Miniſter of Baptiſme did dip, or immerge the Baptiſed, waſhing them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; and that Paul *did expound this immerſion, by the Allegorical Death and Reſurrection,* Rom. 6. and Col. 2. *And therefore Baptiſme is called, the Lavar, or waſhing of Regeneration,* Epheſ. 5. and Tit. 3. *And that* Ananias *commanded* Paul *to waſh away his ſins.*

The truth hereof Maſter *Wills* could not but know, and no other then I did before in ſubſtance declare, and therefore for him to ſay, that they do not ſay this, but the contrary, is to me wonderful ſtrange. Neither do they mention any thing of all thoſe ten Lines, of his, ſaid to be in this place, as though they took the word to ſignifie *Waſhing*, in oppoſition to *Dipping*; and if in any other part of the Book

Book they do say so, it will but *discover* a contradiction to *themselves*, but especially to the truth, that with so much evidence, they have here *demonstrated*, therefore what *apparent* injury this is let all *men judge*.

And as to the other, it is as *Notorious* as this; for I do not say; *That the* Magdeburgs *tell us, that the custom of dipping the whole Body, was changed into sprinkling, &c. This Century as he fathers upon me.* 4. Answer.

All that I say is this, (and they are my own words, not theirs; after I had mentioned their understanding, of that Rite and Ceremony, from the nature of the word, and usage thereof in Scripture) *viz.*

„ Which said custom of dipping the whole „ Body in water, was changed into sprinkling „ a little water in the face; *And not as Mr.* „ Wills *perverts my words, That I say,* [*they tell us „ so*] *I neither expres'd, nor intended any such thing.* much less that they should tell us, of any such change that Century. Whereas as he says well, that there is not the least hint of the matter of *sprinkling* in this or the following *Century*. And which I do also afterwards take notice of, in thee words:

„ *That until the third Century we find not any,* „ *that upon any consideration did admit of sprinkling:* „ *The first we meet with, is in* Cyprians *Epist.* „ to Magnus, *about Clynical Baptisme. which* „ *might sufficiently have satisfied Mr.* Wills, *that* „ *I did neither express, or could intend the words as* „ *he carryes them. I did also in my second Impression.* (which I presume he could not, but see waiting

ſo many months for its coming forth, before he would put his into the Preſs, as his Printer and Stationer both informed me) make ſome better *diſtinction*, by putting the *foregoing* words into a different *character*, leaſt theſe latter *words* ſhould be ſuppoſed not to be my own, and which might have been further light to him, if prejudice had not *blinded* the eye, diſcovering that his buſineſs was, that if he could not find a hole, he would make one. And that the *Antients* for theſe four firſt Centuries, uſed, and aſſerted Dipping, Mr. *Wills* that reads the Centuries, cannot be a Stranger to, as teſtified by ſo many of the Fathers.

5. Falſhoods charged.

An other Falſhood he would father upon me, is that, I ſhould ſay *p.* 113. *of the former which is* pag. 101. *of the laſt, that they tell us: That the cuſtom of* dipping *the whole Body into water, was changed into ſprinkling in the third Century, and that cites the* Magdeburgs *Century* 3. p. 125, 126. *Where he ſaith, they ſay no ſuch thing, but the contrary.*

5. Anſw.

Wherein he doth me manifeſt injury, for all *that* I ſay to that point, as you'l find, is this; *viz.* "*Many were the corruptions about Baptiſme, that* "*in this Age were creeping in, ſome whereof, I men-*"*tioned, and amongſt the reſt, Altering the form from* "*dipping to ſprinkling:* But I do not quote pag. 125. 126. for that, but for the ſuperſtitious Rites, but did only thereby intend (as after I expreſs'd it p. 204.) that *paſſage* in *Cyprians* Letter to *Magnus*, admitting *ſprinkling* to a ſick Perſon; I do not therefore ſay, it was *changed*, but that is was amongſt thoſe corruptions that were creeping in.

And

" And withall do in the same place say, *That they do* " *not find by any Authentick Testimony, that any one* " *Person was actualy baptised in this manner this Age.* " And p. 204. *That we find not any, upon any consideration, that did admit of sprinkling till* Cyprians " *Letter, &c.* Which afterwards was brought into use for sick Children, and then for all Children.

And yet this unfaithful Man, notwithstanding all these my expressions to the *contrary*, is not ashamed to say, *That I say, the custom of dipping the whole Man, was changed into sprinkling, in the third Century, and that I quote for it Cent. 3. p. 125, 126.* when I neither do the *one* nor the *other*. And concerning this rite of dipping, you will hear more of me to this point, in a following Chapter; whereby you will *understand*, that notwithstanding this Notion of *Cyprians*, about sprinkling the *sick*, yet that dipping was the *universal* custom, which was observed for the first four Centuries, and some Ages after, as I shall manifest from approved Authors.

In the next place, he charges me with fathering several things upon the *Magdeburgs*, respecting the fourth Century, whereof one word is not to be *found* in them, as his pag 10. 1. part 7. chapter.

As first, *That it was the universal practice of this Age, to baptise the Adult, upon Profession of Faith, Whereas they say the quite contrary, proving, saith he, that in the Churches of* Affrica *they baptised Infants in this Age by* Athanasius 114. *and* 124 *Questions to* Anciochus. *And that they baptised Infants in the Churches of* Asia, *by* Gregory Nazien- 6. I alhood charged.

zens *abſolute determinations to Baptize Infants.*

6. Anſwer. To which I reply, That I do not ſay, that the *Magdeburgs* do ſay in ſo many words, that it was the univerſal practiſe of this *Age*, to Baptize the *Adult* upon Profeſſion of *Faith*, as he would *inſinuate*: But as you'l find my words to be, as pag. 55. "*That from the ſeveral Authorities they give us, out of the learned Fathers and Councels, they tell us ſo*; *viz.* by the *inſtances* they do *produce*, and which I have before at large *demonſtrated*, ſo that at leaſt wiſe I judge, I have cauſe to *think* ſo.

And as to the two inſtances he gives, to detect my *forgery*, they ſignify nothing: As to that of *Gregory Nazienzens*, we have ſaid enough already, to which we refer you, and which will ſubſtantialy acquit me from this charge.

And ſecondly, as to that of *Athanaſius* Queſtions to *Antiochus*, prooving that they *Baptized Infants* in the *Affrican Church*, particularly the 124. Queſtion, which he mentions pag. 10. ch. 7. 1. part: I ſhall ſhew you *preſently* it was a meer piece of *forgery*, and no truth at all in it, and which Mr. *Wills* could not well be *ignorant* of, though he would thus abuſe the World with this Story. But he ſhould have done well, to have told you, what *that* 124. *Queſtion* was, that he ſo much *brags of*; which I perceive he was unwilling to do upon another ſcore, leaſt his inſtance might do him more hurt, then good, though the 114. he mentions *at large*; The thing expreſſed therein, as the *Magdeburgs* tell us, is this: *Quod Infantem ait ter in aquam immergemus, & ter edu-*

cimus

nus mortem, & tridnanum Resurrectionem significamus Cent. 4. c. 6. p. 419.

That we dip the infant, saith he, *three times in the water, and three times bring it out again, signifying the death, and three days Resurrection of Christ.* So that you see the Reason, why he was ashamed of his *instance*, because he was affraid, with the proving his *Infants Baptisme*, he should have offred some thing for the rite of *dipping*, which is so *loathsome* to him, and so loose more, then he should get by the *bargain*.

It is true the Inventer of this *lye*, must tell some thing that was *true*, as to the season he intends it, which was the *trine immersion*, that from *Tertullians* time, till after this Age, was so much used, as *Jerom*, *Ambrose*, *Bazil*, yea all of them with one mouth do declare; as the learned *Vossius* to this point sheweth, *Thes.* 6 *pag.* 32, *to* 42. concluding after the recital of most of the Fathers, and Ancients to prove it. *Hæc satis ostendunt ter immersisse Veteres, & mystici quid in eo constituisse.* These (Authorities) enough shew, that the Ancients did use the threefold immersion, and the mystery designed, and contained therein. And which is not mentioned, that a three fold dipping is *approved*, or that there was any *ground* for it (but a perfect invention, wherein these *Fathers* did so much abound) *only* that *sprinkling* was not the *rite*, and that *dipping* was owned to be the custome in these first times, which Mr. *Wills* will not admit,

Secondly, he charges me to pervert the saying of *Athanasius*, as when speaking for *Adult* 7. Falshood charged. *Bap-*

Baptisme, he might not be for *Infants* Baptisme also. Whereas he meant by the former only *Pagans*, and *Infidels*, who according to Christs Commission must first be taught, then baptised. *Athanasius* (saith he) *was for Infants Baptisme, and it was practised in his dayes, as appears by the 114 Question to* Antiochus, *Where he resolves a doubt that might arise from the death of Infants, whether they go to Heaven or no? Seeing, the Lord saith, suffer little Children to come to me, for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven? And the Apostle saith? Now your Children are holy, it plainly follows that the Infants of Believers, which are baptised do as unbaptised, and faithful enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.*

Where, saith he, mark again how unworthily Anabaptists abuse the Fathers; in saying their strongest Argument for Childrens Baptisme, is from Tradition, which they slye too, for want of Scripture. Implying here are two Scriptures for Infants Baptisme, improved by this Father, one *Mat.* 19. 14 *of such is the Kingdom of Heaven*; and the other because the Infants of Believers are baptised, they are therefore holy, *allusing to holiness of Children*, mentioned by the Apostle 1 *Cor.* 7. 14 as though that was obtained by Baptisme, and which was the opinion of some of the Ancients also.

3. Answer. To which I say & is not this excellently *remark'd* from this famous *instance?* and Anabaptists unworthyness too? in taking no more regard, how well they proved Infants *Baptisme* of old from the Scripture?

But now this Book of Questions fathered upon *Athanasius*, proving such another *Fable*, as

that

that goodly piece that was fathered upon *Dionysius*. It will only serve further, to discover what inventions, the Father of Lyes had (by the working of the *Mystery of Iniquity*) not only to beget and usher in, but to nurish and strengthen this *Illegitimate* Birth, but the artifice, also he had to time the several forgeries; *viz.* *Dionysius* for the first; the *Popes* Decretals, and *Justin* Martyrs Responses, for the second; *Origen's* Storyes, for the third; these Questions of *Athanasius*, for the fourth Age. And how ready and willing Persons are to this very time, to catch up any of these lying Fables, to strengthen themselves in deceits; Nay, there is good ground to believe, that they know them so to be, that so abuse the *World* therewith. For how can Mr. *Wills*, that is so well *read* in the *Magdeburgs*, be *ignorant*, how notably they have *detected* this Cheat, and the reasons and *grounds* they give of its *Spuriousness*? and therefore it must needs be so much worse in him, to impose this falacy a fresh, and so to improve it too, as though it was a piece of Gospel.

Know therefore, besides what *Merningus*, and *Montanus* say of its forgery, of which I gave you a hint *pag.* 57. (whereof Mr. *Wills* would take no notice:) And what *Scultetus* (as Mr. *Tombes* tells us) in his *Medul. Pat. p.* 2. *l.* 1. *c.* 42. saith of it also. The *Magdeburgs* do give us this account, which I presume Mr. *Wills* can tell you, as well as my self, being so considerable a Remark in the History of *Athanasius* his life, as you have it *Century* 4. *cap.* 10. *p.* 1032 in these

words, speaking of his works: *Quartus tom quadam habet a diversis translata interpretibus, Libellum de variis Quaestionibus Sacrae Scripturae* Antiochum *Principem, interprete* Valentino *Ampelandio quem Librum* Athanasii *non esse indeliqu quod ab ejus Authore* Athanasius *citatur Quaestio vigesima tertia hoc modo, & haec quidem mult valens in Divina Scriptura Magnus* Athanasius, *nos vero qui ab ipso sumus illuminati, &c. Accidit hoc quod multos videre est in eo scripto, nam atque opiniones ab* Athanasio *alienas.*

The fourth Tome hath some things translated diverse Interpreters, as for instance the Book of various Questions of the holy Scriptures to Prince Antiochus (Valentinus Ampelandius *being the Interpreter*) *which Book that it is not* Athanasius *is thence manifested, because* Athanasius *is cited the Author thereof in the 23. Question, in the manner: And these things indeed saith the great* Athanasius, *who was mighty in the Scriptures, but we who are inlightned by him, &c.*

And hereto it may be added (say they) *that may see in that Writer many errors and opinions, that are far from* Athanasius's.

By which you may see, the design of this wicked *cheat*, by fathering this false *thing* upon this man of *name*, to wit to bring some Reputation upon *Infants Baptisme*, as though owned and practised by the great *Athanasius* in this *Age*, and which our *Antagonist* falls in with, and *improves* to the *utmost*. First, in the severe *check* he is pleased to give me, for perverting, as he calls it, the *Testimony* given by him for Adult, against his *judgment*

ment, and practice of Infants *Baptisme*, as appears by these two Questions urged. Secondly, for our so little regarding what the Fathers say, when they urge *Scripture*, as well as *Tradition* for Infants *Baptisme*, witness those two pertinent *Scriptures*, urged by this eminent *Father*.

Thirdly, for drawing the injurious *conclusion*, that Infants *Baptisme* was not practised in *Affrica* in this Age, from his *Testimony* for *Adult Baptisme*, when the contrary so manifestly appears from *those* Questions.

But now this goodly story, proving a lye, doth not the contrary to all these, naturally *Recoyl* upon himself? And fully discover, that till we have better *evidence* to the contrary, that however *Athanasius* plaid the *Bishop*, and baptised his School-fellow, when a Boy in *sport*, that when he *came* to better understanding, he gave *countenance* to no other Baptisme, then to that of the Adult only, according to Christs Commission.

The next piece of fraud and injustice he charges upon me, is *the curtailing and leaving out part of a Sentence, quoted out of* Bazil pag. 65. *mentioned by him* chap. 7. 1. part. pag. 13. *and hinted at also in his Preface: The Quotation is to prove, as he Remarks, that Adult Baptisme was then only practised in the Eastern Churches, which are two sayings out of* Bazil: *One out of his* 3. *Book against* Eunomius, viz. *must the faithful be sealed with Baptisme, Faith must needs precede, and go before. And in his Exhortation to Baptisme, that none were to be baptised but the Catechumens, and those* 8. Falshood charged,

those that were duly instructed in the Faith. Upon which he saith, *Now this is sufficient to impose a fallacy upon any Reader, that hath no* Aquaintance *with that Father, and understand not in what sence he speaks, who would not think that this Ancient Doctor was against Infants Baptisme, and that no such thing was owned in the Church in his dayes?* [very true, and so one would indeed, for if *Faith must go before, and Children have no Faith*, then only professed Believers were the Subjects.] And again, if *None but the Catechument, and those instructed in the Faith were to be Baptised*, then surely no Children were to be Baptised, who were so uncapable, both of the one, and the other; Therefore by the way it must be *granted*, that this was a *proper proof*, to evidence, that the *Eastern Church* in his time admitted only of *Adult Baptisme*, which he is pleased to say, is so *abominably false*.

And to evince my Forgery and Falshood, from the good acquaintance he would have, you think, he had with this Father; that the same Author, *viz. Bazil* in the very next lines, *which I had above cited, speak thus, as he confidently affirms: What then say you of Infants, who neither know good nor evil, may we baptise them? Yea, saith he, for so we are taught by the Circumcising of Children. And therefore, saith he, hereforward have a care, Reader, how ye trust the Authors Quotations, for the palpable abuse done to this Father.*

8. Answer. To which I say, but if the abuse prove his own, what then? And that it is so, the Reader will

will presently understand. Know therefore, that the Quotations out of *Basil's* Exhortation to Baptisme, you'l find in the *Magdeburgs* Century 4. cap. 6. p. 416. in these words, *Basilius non alios quam Catechumenos Baptizatos esse scribit*: Basil, *say they, writes that none other but the Catechumens were baptised*: And then in the next lines immediately following, nothing intervening say, *Qui in Paschale convocabantur in Exhortatione ad Baptismum: Who are called together at Easter to be exhorted in order to their Baptisme.* There being no such syllable, nor any thing like it, either in the forgoing or following words, I have also searched all that the *Magdeburgs* say of that Father, and all *Basils* works themselves, and particularly the third Book against *Eunomius*; but can find nothing *like* it. I have also *Examined* the great *Dutch* Book of *Martyrs*, that recites most of the principal passages that *Basil* speaks of Baptisme; and who from *Mirinæus* and *Montanus*, their great Century Writers, do testify, that he was altogether for Adult, and wholy against Infants Baptisme. He used to say, *Sicut enim credimus in Patrem, & Filium, & Spiritum Sanctum, sic & Baptizamur in nomine Patris, & Filii, & Spiritus Sancti: As we do believe in the name of the Father, Son, and holy Spirit, so we may be baptised in their names*, Cent. 4. p. 235. And in the definition he gives of Baptisme, he calls it: *Sigillum Fidei, Tessera Christiani Militis, similitudo mortis sepulturæ, ac resurrectionis mortuorum*: *The Seal of Faith, the Badge of the Christian Soldier, and the Symbole of death, burial, and*

& Resurrection from the dead. And again very fully, *Quicunque baptizantur, sive Judæus, sive Græcus, sive Masculus, sive Fœmina, quæcunque generis differentia nominatus, exuunt in sanguine Christi veterem hominem, cum actibus suis, & per doctrinam ipsius novum in Spiritu Sancto induunt, qui secundum Deum conditus est in justitia, & sanctitate veritatis, ac renovatur ad ignitionem, secundum imaginem ejus qui condidit ipsum, &c.*

That whoever is baptised, whether Jew or Greek, male or female, &c. have put off (by the Blood of Christ) the old Man with his acts, and by his Doctrine have put on the new Man by the holy Spirit, who according to God is built up in the Righteousness and holyness of the truth, and renewed in knowledge, according to the Image of him that created him, &c. And therefore in his Book of Baptisme, doth largely treate of the necessity of partaking of the Lords Supper, that other Ordinance of Christ, immediately after Baptisme.

Regenerati vero, & in nomine Filii baptizati sumus, & Filii Dei declarati opus itaque deinceps, & nutriamur cibo vitæ æternæ: Those of us that are Regenerate, and have made declaration of the Son of God, and are Baptised in his name, it is meet that we should immediately be nurished with the food of Eternal life, viz. *the Bread of God in that Ordinance.*

And whether all this is not agreeable, to what before was said of this Doctor, is left to the Reader to judge, being also one of those (say the *Magdeburgs*) that made that former Decree in the Councel of *Neocæsaria*. But you'l say, how came

came Mr. *Wills* by this saying, it is to be supposed, he did not make it? which will be with him to declare, and how he came to father it upon *Basil*, that no man could ever find in him before. It is true, the words I find *exactly* to be the words of *Gregory Nazienzen*, but not of *Basil*, as Cent. 4. cap. 4. p. 234. *Orations in sanctum Lavacrum tertia: Quid de Infantibus ais qui neque gratia, quid ne sit pana cognorunt, nam & illos baptizemus? Maxime quidem* [*si periculum aliquod immineat, melius est enim nondum rationis compotes sanctificari quam non signatos & initiatos vita excedere*] all which Mr. *Wills* leaves out, then adds, *Idque nobis designat post octavum diem Circumcisio illa, qua figurale fuit signaculum. What will you say of Children, which are neither sensible of good or evil? shall we Baptisme them, yes by all means* [*in Case of urgent danger, for it is better to be sanctified without their knowledge, then to dye without it*] *for so it hapned to the Children of Israel in Circumcision.*

But suppose there had been such a *Sentence*, as Mr. *Wills* saith *followeth*, I had cited enough of the Father, to *confirm* the truth of what I *asserted*, viz. that *instruction* and *Faith*, according to Christs *Commission*, was necessary to precede Baptisme; And that none but the Adult, that made Profession of *Faith*, were to be *baptised*: And if he should have contradicted himself, as some others had done, it would have been their *parts* that should avouch *him*, in the behalf of Infants Baptisme, to have reconciled such a contradiction, to those his former *assertions*.

But

But to put the matter more out of doubt, I procured a Friend to write to Master *Wills*, to know where that passage was to be *found* in *Bazil*; To which he made this following return, *viz.* *As to that passage of* Bazil, *I do not charge Master D. with misquoting, but partially quoting and misapplying him, and upon Examination of my Papers, cannot find any Page, to which that passage of mine, concerning that Father, doth refer: But when I go to* Oxford, *where I made my Collection, I may be able to give better satisfaction.*

Mr. Wills Letter to his Friend about the Quotation of Bazil.

Therefore upon the whole, respecting this passage, I appeal to the *Reader*, whether Mr. *Wills* is not found *tardy* and justly *reprovable* in the following particulars; *viz.*

Mr. Wills' guilty of much falshood herein.

First, for the several Falshoods (that it is to be feared, he knowingly imposed upon the Reader) in affirming so positively: 1. That *these* were the very *next Lines*, to what I had above recited. Secondly, that *Bazil* was herein an Eminent witness for *Infants Baptisme*, in the fourth Century p. 136. Thirdly, from the great *acquaintance he had with this Father and his sence herein* (a false and vain glorious boast) *affirmes these words to be his, in his third Book contra Eunomium* pag 13. *comp.* pag. 136. Fourthly, For his deceitful leaving out part of *Nazienzens* words, which should discover them to be his (a great Demonstration it was, not *lapsus calami*, but *mentis*; not a sin of ignorance, or a meer mistake, but a willful abuse.

2 False Accusation.

Secondly, for false *accusing* of me: First, for *curtailing*, partially quoting, and misapplying this *Father* stoping, where I should have *gone on*.

Se-

Secondly, For *imposing* a fallacy, and *Falshood* upon the Reader, to say he was only for Adult Baptisme, when the contrary was so *manifest*. Thirdly, For so palpably *abusing* that Father, that I was not to be trusted in my *Quotations*, for time to come.

Therefore, is it not very *considerable*, and to be remark'd, that whilest he would pretend to *reprove*, and render me odious for *Prevarication*, *Forgery* and *Falshood*, that he himself shou'd be so left, to do the *same* things, in a far worse manner? fulfilling *Rom.* 2. 21, 22.

Another Lye and Falshood, declaring, as he saith, *want of honesty and conscience in me*, p. 44. *In the bringing*, the Waldenses *as Witnesses against Infants Baptisme*, and amongst other *evidence* for the same, to produce their *Confessions of Faith*, *Whereas there is not a word of that importance in them, but their Confessions of Faith quite otherwise*, viz. *for Infants Baptisme*. 9. Falshood charged.

To which I answer, that it is a very *heinous charge*, but what truth there is in it, and who most *guilty* of lying, and *forgery*, therein, he, or I, you will easely *discern*, when you come to the Examination of that matter, in the third Chapter, to which I refer you. Answer.

Again, there are two other instances of *Forgery* and *Falshood* he charges upon me, in abusing, and deceitfully *perverting* the sayings of two of our moderne Authors, Mr. *Baxter*, and Dr. *Taylor*, which I shall add hereto, and be accomptable for in this place.

And first, he is pleased to say, *That I have* 10. For as

Falſhood & unworthy dealing with Mr. Baxter.

as an unworthy Perſon deals craftely, and ſiniſterly with Mr. Baxter, pag. 12, 13. *and disingeniously perverted, and traduced, the ſayings of that worthy Man, to countenance my Errours; Quoting divers of his Arguments to Mr.* Blake, *as though he had been only for Believers Baptiſme, when he had ſo fully explained himſelf to mean Adult, not Infants Baptiſme,* which he particularly excepted therein.

Anſwer.

In anſwer hereto, (overlooking his *uncivil*, and *unchriſtian Language*) I ſay, that in my *producing* thoſe Arguments of Mr. *Baxter*, from Mr. *Tombes*, I have again, and again, given the Reaſons he produceth, for the *ſame*, and that induced me to *inſert them*; which Mr. *Wills* had done well, to have taken ſome *notice of*: For if Mr. *Baxter* hath contradicted *himſelf*, he hath no more *injury* done him, to take notice of it, and improve it for the truth; then as Mr. *Tombes* tells him, the Papiſts had by Biſhop *Morton* improving, their contradictions, for the benefit of the Proteſtant Cauſe. And if Mr. *Baxter*, or any Body for him, can reconcile thoſe ſeeming *contradictions*. I have only put an advantage into his hand, to do himſelf, and the cauſe he pleades *right*, and concerning which all judgements muſt be *ſuſpended*, till Mr. *Baxter* be heard to ſpeak for himſelf therein, which he has promiſed *to do*. And I preſume, ſince Mr. *Wills* has not thought good, to *anſwer* Mr. *Tombes* his *Arguments*, or my Apology, for *producing* thoſe Arguments, he had much better have *forborne* his uncivil *Revilings* upon it, which only for the moſt part beſpeaks, either an *evil Cauſe*, or an evil *Nature*,

ture, and which neither *reproves*, or *convinceth* any.

And after the same manner, he *deals* with me upon Mr. *Baxters* account, for the repetition of some *passages* out of his Christian Directory (which were so *greiving*, and offensive to most Protestant ears) charging me most *severly*, viz. *That as being possess'd with a malevolant Spirit, and filled with envy against him, and glad of an occasion to wound his Reputation, who had so wounded our Cause, I came forth therein with a seeming zeal for truth, but he feared with greater enmity to his Person therein.* Mr. Wills his calumny.

In answer to this slanderous *reproach*, I can truly say, I am so far from bearing *enmity* to his Person, more especially for what he has *said in that* Book (what wonders soever (as he boasts in his Ep.) he has done thereby, in Exorcising, or conjuring down the unquiet Spirit (as he maliciously calls it) of Anabaptisme) wherein, as Dr. *Barlo* so well observes, he has said so much, to so little purpose, there being nothing therein like an Argument against us, and therefore no cause to envy him for the same; That I have hath an *honourable* regard to his *Person*, and a due value to his *Labours*, especially where he has laid out himself to promote practical *Holyness* (and wherein, as I have judged, his greatest *Excellency* lyes) supposing had he let Controversies alone, and addicted himself *thereto*, he would much more have *furthered* the Peace, and Union, he pretends to promote. It having been, as I have heard, a judgement that Bishop *Usher* made of him, Answer.

that if he persisted in Polemical writings, that he was like to prove a *Troubler*, rather then a *Promoter* of Peace.

As for those passages, collected and Epitomized out of his *Christian* Directory, they were no less *astonishing* then greiving to many; that under pretence to general *Reconcilisation*, he should endeavour to *Reconcile* us to so much, both of the *Doctrine*, and *discipline* of the Church of *Rome*. And surely if Conscience had not *engaged* me, prudence had all together forbid, to have provok'd so potent and Adversary, and who useth with so much severity to treat his *Opposites*: But the Cause is Gods, with whom I *leave* it, who can plead his own truth in his Conscience, and out of the Mouths of Babes can *perfect* his own *praise*, because of Enemyes, and Avengers.

11. Falshood, or delusion, respecting Dr. Taylers work.

An other hainous thing he layes to my charge, is for my *delusion*, as he calls it, in Doctor *Taylers* Case, by improving his sayings, *in his Liberty of Prophecy*; as though he was wholy for us, when what he saith therein, was but to represent our *falacious Reasoning*; *and not to speak his own judgement therein*: And the better to convince the World hereof, and stop the Mouths *of those that were* ready to take *advantage thereat*, *he had since put forth*, *an Excellent piece called*, *A Consideration of the Practise of the Church*, *in Baptizing Infants of Believing Parents*. *And withall that thoughhe himself has not answered those Arguments*, *in his Liberty of Prophecy*, *which some thought stood in need of answering*; *Yet Doctor Hamond has effectually done the same*, *in his Letter of*

Re-

Resolution to six Queryes, pag. 35, 36, &c.

To which I reply: That as to those *Arguments of Doctor Taylers*, I have already in the *Preface* of both my Books said to this *purpose*. "That *whatever was his judgment, or end, in writing those things*, yet it was meet to remark them "to the World, that the Wisdom, and Power of God "might more appear, if an Enemy to bring forth "such convincing Arguments, and Reasons, from "his own mouth, to witness to his disfised reproached "truth." Answ.

Yet truly, for what as yet appears to the *contrary*, the Doctor seems to have spoken therein his own, as well as *our apprehension*, in the greatest part of those *Arguments*, and that for these following *Demonstrations*: Reasons why the plea for Anabaptists was Dr. Taylers own sence.

First, Because the Doctor having spoken to all the usual *Arguments*: brought by the *Protestants* for Infants Baptisme, and *answered* them distinctly, doth in the *conclusion* (*speaking* his own words, say *these two things very considerable. First, that through the weakness of the Pædobaptists Arguments, which are not good in themselves, those other Arguments in plea for the Anabaptists, are good in opposing them, and so they are accidentally strenghtned* (in their errour, as he calls it) *by the weakness, and confidence of weak opposition.* And it is to be observed, that those *Arguments*, which he so reproves as weak, and with so much *Demonstration* hath Baffled, are these that *follow* (summed up briefly in his own words, *Liberty of Prophecy* p. 228) First, *the Arguments pleaded from the insinuation of the Type*, viz. *Circumcision* 1. Reason. Pædobaptists Arguments by Dr. Taylor.

Gen. 17. *Secondly, From the action of Christ, calling little Children to come to him, to bless them,* Matth. 19. 14. *Thirdly, From the Title Infants have to Heaven. Fourthly, From the Gospel, Institution, and Precept,* Joh. 3. 5. *Fifthly, From the energy of the promise* Acts 2. 38, 39. *Sixthly, From the Reasonableness of the thing,* 1 Cor. 7. *Seventhly, From the infinite necessity on the Childrens part. Eightly, From the Apostolical practice, who having Commission to teach all Nations, baptizing them, did Baptize whole Houshelds, Infants being part of Nations, and Houshelds. Tenthly, From the universal practise of the Church, and Gossips, to answer for them, to supply incapacity, made good by Tradition.*

The Answer he gives hereto.

These are the Arguments, that he answers *distinctly*, which *first* in the *Anabaptists* plea he saith, *pretend fairly, and signify nothing. some of these Allegations being false, some impertinent, and all the rest insufficient.* And all which (agreeable hereto) in his own words, after he had replyed to every one of them, he was pleased to *pronounce* weak, and *insufficient*, and which had therefore given so much strength, and confirmation to the *Anabaptists* way.

2. Reason.

And Secondly, concludes all with these words, **That there is much more truth, then evidence on their side**; and giving no better, or other Argument, to *demonstrate* that *truth* was with them.

Now I appeal to all Men of *understanding*, whether any but a *Person*, that disponded the *goodness* of his *Cause*, and designed wholy to

give

give it up, could say, that the *evidence*, *demonstration*, or *proof*, was on his Adversaries *side*, all his own pleas brought forth; being removed, and taken away, himself being *Judge*.

But 'tis said, *That though he mentioned no other Arguments then, yet he afterwards did, in that, which Mr.* Wills *calls, his Excellent piece for Infants Baptisme*, Wills p. 36. Objection.

It is true, about six years after he had writen his *Liberty of Prophecy* (that being writ 1647.) he did Anno 1653. (being much laid at, by many of his Friends, and having given such general offence to his whole party thereby) take himself; concerned to say something, to perswade the *World* he was of an other mind, though when he had said it, it amounts to just nothing to any considering Person, and which may appear to you from these Reasons following. Answer. Being a Reason.

First, Because he undertakes not to answer, or *invalidate* one of those *Arguments*, whereby he had on the *Anabaptists* behalf, overthrown all those weak *Arguments*, before mentioned; and that though some *judged* they stood in need of *answering*, and that he had *thoughts* to have done it, yet he forbore it upon some considerations, which Master *Wills* repeates from him, p. 35. 1. D. Tayler Answers none of those Arguments.

Secondly, Because what he saith in that Treatise (which Mr. *Wills* so boasts off) is not any new thing, but some of the very same Arguments, he had before judged so *weak*, and insufficient, and had so substantially answered, and *baffled*. As first, that from *Circumcision*. Secondly, *From* 2. Repeats only some of the old Baffled Arguments.

Children right to the Kingdom of Heaven. Thirdly, *To adopt them into the Covenant.* Fourthly, *From Apostolical tradition;* Only adds *two or three more savoring, more grosly of Popery*, viz. from the use, and *necessity of Baptisme to pardon thiir sin; Regenerate, and save them.*

3. Because in other Books he confirmed the truth of them.

And Thirdly, it also appears, that he spoke his own mind and sense therein, because in those two Books he wrote so many years after; viz. in his *Diswasive against Popery* second part; and in his *Rule of Conscience*, he hath spoken so much *agreeable* hereto, as before hath been observed to you: *viz.* That *there was no Apostolical Tradition for Infants Baptisme. That it was not practised till the third, nor judged necessary till the fourth Century. That there was no Scriptural proof for Infants Baptisme. That the Children of Christian Parents were not Baptised, till they came to understanding, for the first Ages. And that dipping, and not sprinkling was the usage of Christ, and his Apostles, and constant Doctrine, and practise of the the Ancients for many hundred years.* And which I conceive are substantial Arguments, to prove the Doctor spoke his *own*, *as well* as our judgement therein; and which I must stand by, till I see better Reason to the contrary.

Objection.

But 'tis said one Reason Doctor *Tayler* gives, why he did *not answer* those Arguments, was because his *worthy Friend Doctor* Hamond; *had in charity, and humility descended to answer that Collection.*

Answer.

It is true indeed, Doctor *Hamond* in that piece, called his Letter of *Resolutoin* to *six Queries*;

Bound

Bound up now in his first *volume* in Folio, p. 481 doth therein pretend to reply thereto; as being, as he confesseth, *the most diligent Collection that he ever met with, wherein the Arguments of the Adversaries are so inforced, that he knew not where to furnish himself with so exact a scheame.* But how far he hath performed that *Task*, and answered those *Arguments*, let the impartial Reader judge; Who instead of *answering* hath rather *inforced*, and subscribed to the truth of so many of them, and reproved rather the weakness, and insufficiency of so many of the chiefest *Arguments*, brought by the Pædobaptists, concluding his Discourse with Doctor *Taylers* own words, to that purpose, *viz. I consent to the truth of the Doctors observation: That the Anabaptists have been encouraged in their error, more by accidental advantages given them, by the weakness of those Arguments, that have been brought against them, then by any truth of their Cause, or Excellency of their wit, &c.*

Dr. Hamond rather confirms then answers those Arguments and why.

And therefore doth he in that *Discourse* acknowledge these following things:

First, *The weak arguings from Circumcision either to its typicalness, identity, Reason of difference, or invalidity of paralel with Baptisme, so as to found Infants Baptisme upon them*, pag. 482, &c. comp. 474. sect. 20.

Secondly, *The inconcludent Argument from Act. 2. 39. Children their, as he fully grants, being really their Posterity, not particularly the Infants of the Jews*, p. 490. sect. 81.

Thirdly, *That to infer Infants Baptisme from*

Falshoods injuriously charged by Mr. Wills

Christs Precept to baptize all Nations, is one of the blind and lame, that is of more use to betray and loose, then to defend and secure the Fort, p. 492. sect. 96.

Fourthly, *That to conclude Infants were baptised, because Houshold are so mentioned to be, is unconvincing, and without demonstration, it being so uncertain whether there was any Child in the Families*, p. 471. sect. 21.

Fifthly, *That Arguments from* Matth. 19. 14. *are imperfect ways of Probation*, p. 474. sect. 23.

The other Arguments Dr. Hamond urgeth for Infants Baptisme.

It is true the Doctor useth other *Medium's*, to confirm and establish Infants Baptisme by, which are not usually urged by the Pædobaptists, and which because the Doctor layes so much stress upon, and Mr. *Wills* seems also much to glory in, we shall give you some account of them.

1. From the Jewish Baptisme.

The first is, because Christs Institution of Baptisme, doth not exclude Infants from Baptisme, there being nothing in Christs Commission, that is against it, pag. 475. sect. 75. And Mr. *Wills* pag. 131, 132. To which you have an answer in the next Chapter, by an other hand, to whom I must refer you.

The Second, and chief of the Doctors Arguments, and upon which he seems to lay the greatest stress, to found and inforce Infants Baptisme, is from the Custom of Baptizing among the Jews of old, from the *first giving of the Law*, from whom Christ, *as he saith, took the usage, and made it a Sacrament: And who did baptise, as he tells us, not only the Native Jews, upon their admission into the Covenant, but the Proselytes, both*

both Men, and Women, and their Children also; And which he pretends to make good, out of the Jews *Talmud*, by *Maimonides*, a great Jewish Doctor; *Rabi Joshua*, another; and the *Gemara Babylon. Tit. Chirithoth*, and particularly concerning their *Infants*, that *they were baptised upon the knowledge of the House of judgement*; viz. *on their desire and behalf of the Children*, and their *promise to let them know, what they have undertaken for them*, as saith the Doctor; and that thereby Gossips, or *Suscepters* are also *warranted*; so *agreeable to what Saint Austin* saith, *Our Mother the Church lends the little ones, other Mens feet, ears, and tongue, that they may come, believe, and confess, and so be capable of Baptisme*; pag. 470. to. 474. *and which Mr.* Wills *takes in for Gospel too*. pag. 141. Proved out of the Talmud.

Now, if this be a *good* and substantial *basis*, and *foundation* for Infants *Baptisme*, and well proved, let all Men judge?

In answer to which new and strange Doctrine, I shall refer the Reader to the Reply, that (I suppose) was made hereto, by that judicious, and *learned Gentleman* Sir *Norton Knatchbull*, in his *Animadversiones in Lib. Novi Testamenti*, pag. 315. *Accum videam summi judicii Viros in his temporibus, & Rabbinis fundamenta petere veritatis, &c.* But when I see in these times, some Men of the greatest judgement, to fetch the foundation of truth from the Rabbins, I cannot but stick at it, for whence was the Talmud sent to us (they are the words, (saith he) of *Buxtorf*, in his *Synagoga Judaica*) that we should give so much credit thereto, Sr. Norton Knatchbull's answer hereto.

than

that we should believe that the Mosaick Law, either may or ought to be understood therefrom? Much less the Gospel, to which they are professed Enemyes: The Talmud is called a Labyrinth of errors, and the Foundation of Jewish Fables: It was perfected, and acknowledged for authentick, five hundred years after Christ: And out of it, Maimonides *drew his Doctrine, as also the rest of them; therefore we cannot acquiesce in such testimony.*

And again upon the difference he takes notice of, that was betwixt two of their greatest Rabbi's, upon that point (who were cotemporaries) *viz.* Eliazer, *that affirmed that the Prosolyter were Circumcised, and not Baptised; And* Joshua, *who attested the quite contrary, that they were Baptised and not Circumcised,* saith: *Veri vero potius assentiar?* Eliezero *qui affirmat quod Scriptura, an* Joshua *qui affirmat quod nusquam Scriptura docet: To which of them must we adhear, to* Eliezor *that affirms what the Scriptures teach, or to* Joshua *that asserts what the Scripture no where teacheth? Though* (saith he) *the Rabbins too did cleave to the latter; &c. Magistri vero (quid mirum?) stabant pro Rabbi* Joshua, *satis ut enim in rem suam, in honorem Religionis Judaicæ &c.*

Now that the blind Rabbins should establish their vain Customs, by such Jewish Fables, is no wonder, being so left by God to blindness of eye, and hardness of heart. But that any professing Christianity, should be so left of God, to assert and establish Gospel Ordinances from the Fabulous Talmud, and their lying Rabbies, so directly contrary to the Scripture, is matter of the *great*est admiration.

A

A third Argument is from Antiquity, endeavouring to *prove* the succession thereof from the *Apostles*, and to make it out to be an *Apostolical Tradition*, from the following Authorities, *viz. Justin Martyrs Resp. ad Orth. Irenæus, Higinus, Origen, Cyprian, the Author of the Ecclesiastical Hierachy, St. Augustin, and the Milevitan Council* 479, to 482. The force of all which you'l have tryed in the next following Chapter, to which I refer you. And so you have the substance of Doctor *Hammonds* strong Arguments, wherein I have been the *larger*, because you may be *sufficiently* informed, that he rather confirmed, then answered, *most of the Anabaptists* plea, before *mentioned*. And that the strength of those his strong Arguments (having slighted and canciled so many of the old, as weak and insufficient) may appear to you.

And that upon the whole you may have your satisfaction, whether I had not substantial ground, to quote Doctor *Taylors* Arguments, he gives in his *Liberty of Prophecy*, in the behalf of Believers, and against Infants Baptisme, and whether Mr. *Wills* had reason to charge me with delusion, for producing of them; which as yet stand unanswered for the most part, and I believe ever will do.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

That Infants Baptisme hath neither Foundation in Scripture, or Antiquity, is made good, against Mr. Wills *his pretences to both.*

AS in the former Chapter, so in this, I shall *sum* up what I have said, to justify the *truth* of the *assertion*, what Mr. *Wills grants* thereof, wherein the *force* of his *Objections* lye, and my *Reply* thereto.

1. Section.

That no Precept or Practise for Infants Baptisme.

"*The first thing I did herein, was to make good* "*the Scriptures total silence, either as to Precept,* "*or Practise, for Infants Baptisme, and that by the* "*full grant, and acknowledgement of so many of* "*themselves*; viz. *the Magdeburgs, Luther, Erasmus, Calvin, Bucer, Staphilus, Choelens, Melancton, Zwinglius, Rogers, Baxter*, pag. 89. "to 93

"*As also the necessity of Scripture Precept, or* "*Example, to warrant every Ordinance, by the sayings of Tertullian, Austin, Theophilact, Luther,* "*Calvin, Ball, 6. Art. of the Church of England*, "pag. 93, to 97.

Mr. Wills Answer, & grant.

All which our Antagonist, fully grants, with our forefaid *Authorities*, viz. *That there is neither Precept, or Example for the Baptizing of Infants, that is to say, Expresly, Literally, and Sillabically*, p. 35, 36, 32. *And that Scripture Authority is necessary to warrant every Ordinance*; But withall saith these two things, *viz.*

First

First, that as there is no Scripture expresly commanding so, neither is there any Scripture, excluding, Infants from Baptisme, nor any Scripture that saith there was no Infants baptised, pag. 36, 38, 101, 131, 132. 1. No Scripture forbidding.

Secondly, Though a thing may not expresly be commanded, as Thus saith the Lord Jesus, *Baptise your Children, for they believe; yet that is may be commanded Implicitly, and by Consiquence, though not expresly injoyned in so many words: (And so was the Resurrection by Consiquential Reasoning proved*, Act. 22. 31, 32. Act. 13. 33, 34.) *And what was thus commanded, is as valid, and obliging as if it was in so many Letters, and Syllables; and thus we affirm Infants Baptisme is commanded*, p. 36. *And we affirm against their practise of plunging over head, and ears, that there is no expresse command for the same, nor Example to plunge them as they do, with their Cloathes on*, pag. 101. *And therefore in Mr.* Baxters *words tells us (in his usual Civility) what ignorant Wretches we are, to call for expresse words of Scripture, when we have the evident consequence, or sence, and is Scripture Reason* (saith he) *no Scripture with you?* 2. Good consiquence for it.

To both which I reply, First, to his first *Argument*, that *Infants* Baptisme may *be lawful, because not forbidden in the Scripture, nor no where told where it was no done*; May also prove the *Lawfulness* of Baptizing *Belts*, and Church *Walls*, of *Chrysme*, *Exorcisme*, *Communicating* Infants, and a hundred other inventions, that were practised of old, and still are in use amongst the Papists; neither is it any where told us, in Expres Reply to the first.

press terms, that such things were not practised.

What not commanded in worship, is forbidden.

But this we have clear in the Scripture, and which is to be a Rule to us, in all such Cases, that worship, which in express terms is not commanded, is expresly forbidden; and for which take the following Scriptures, viz.

Col. 2. 20, 21, 22. *If you be dead with Christ, from the rudiments of the World, why as though living in the World, are you subject to Ordinances, (touch not, taste not, handle not) after the Commandements of Men.*

Matth. 15. 9. *But in vain do they worship me, teaching for Doctrine the Commandements of Men.*

Deut. 4. 2. *You shall not add unto the Word, which I command you, neither shall you diminish ought from it, that you may keep the Commandments of the Lord your God, which I commande you.* 12. 32. *What thing soever I command you, observe to do it; thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish therefrom.*

Jer. 7. 31. *And they have built the High places, &c. which I commanded not, neither came it into my heart.*

Jos. 1. 7. *Observe to do, according to all the Law, which Moses my Servant commanded, you shall not turn from it, to the right hand, or to the left.*

Which great truth, is well asserted, and defended, by Doctor *Owen* in his Book, called *Innocency and truth vindicated*, in reply to Doctor *Parker*, who having in his Ecclesiastical *Polity*, p. 189. said (with Mr. *Wills*) that what the Scripture forbids not, it allows, and what it allows, it

Dr. Parker.

unlawful, and what is not unlawful, may lawfully be done. Doctor *Owin* thus answers him, p. 345. *This tale I confess we have been told by many, and many a time, but it hath been as often answered, that the whole of it, as to any thing of reason, is captious, and Sophistical: For if, because they are not forbidden, they may lawfully be introduced, into Divine Worship, then ten thousand things may be made lawful; But the truth is, although a particuler prohibition be needful, to render a thing evil in it self: A general prohibition, is enough to render any thing unlawful in the worship of God, so we grant that what is not forbidden, is lawful; but with all say that every thing is forbidden (that should be esteemed as any part of Divine worship) that is not commanded.* (And therefore very excellently, and undenyable proves, pag. 339.) *That no part of Gods worship, either in the Old, or New Testament, was lawful, but what had some expres warrant, from his Word for the same: And that all Additions, and Traditions of Men therein, God reproved, and rejected as vaine worship.* Dr. Owin.

Secondly, as to his second Argument, that is so much a Kin to the former, *viz. That implicite, and consequential Commands, are as valide, and obliging as if expresly enjoyned, and commanded:* I shall refer him, and the Reader to some eminent Men of his own, for an Answer. Reply to second, viz. That expres not Consiquential Scripture for every part of worship.

Mr. *Collings* before his Vindic. Minist. Evang. tells us: *That in things relating to the worship of God, it is a general Rule in which our Brethren, and we have long since agreed,* **That nothing ought to be done without an expres warrant in the Gospel.** Mr. Collings.

Mr. Rutherford. *Mr.* Rutherford *in his due right of Presbyteries*, pag. 364. *doth also tell us: What the Apostles commanded not, in Gods worship, that the Churches must not do.*

Dr. Owin. But especially Doctor *Owin* in his *Communion with God*, pag. 169, 170, &c. saith *thus*, The *main of the Churches chast, and choice affections to Christ lyes in their keeping his Institutions, and his worship according to his appointment, the breach of this he calls Adultery, and Whoredom, every where, He is a jealous God, and gives himself the Title only, in respect of his Institutions; And the whole Apostacy of the Christian Church, is called Fornication,* Rev. 17. 5. *And the Church that leades the other into false worship, the Mother of Harlots: This then they that hold Communion with Christ, are careful of, they will admit of nothing, in the worship of God, private, or publick, but what they have his warrent for, unless it comes in his Name, with* Thus saith the Lord Jesus, *they will not hear an Angel from Heaven, they know the Apostles themselves were to teach the Saints, only, what Christ commanded them,* Math. 28. 20.

Only plain Scripture for Gods worship. So that what ever ventures, Persons may make in drawing Consiquences, and Inferrences from the Scripture, for any supposed truths (wherein great care, and caution is to be used) yet is it a known agreed Rule amongst Protestants: That in the *Worship of God*, (wherein so much *Sophestry* hath been used to introduce, and impose, not only *Ceremonies* about worship, but worship it self, from Old Testament Rites, and Observations;) Nothing therein as worship is

to

to be admitted, without some plain, and expresse word, by precept, or practise, to *warrant* the same, out of the New Testament. And therefore when Doctor *Parker* in the aforesaid Book falls so foul, upon this Principle (with intention to raze this great *Protestant Bulwark*, and tells us p. 171. *That the very Mystery of Puritanisme, lyes in this very assertion, viz.* That nothing ought to be established, in the worship of God, but what is expressly commanded, in the Word of God, *and that it is a vile, novel, and unreasonable Principle, that takes away all possibility of settlement in the Church, and the main pretence to all pious villanies, &c.* You have Doctor *Owen* pag. 303. most worthely *defending the same, adding only this hereto* [*viz. as part of worship.*] And which *he maintains*, by the *Authority* of *Scripture*, *Reason*, and *Antiquity*. as well as from the testimony of the most learned *Protestant writers*.

Doctor Hamond himself tells us (as Mr. *Towbes* in his Review hath it pag. 847.) viz. *That it is highly unreasonable, that an Institution of Christ, such as each Sacrament is, should be judged of, by any other Rule, whether the fancys, or Reasons of Men, but either the* Word, *wherein the Institution is set down, or the* Records *of the practise of Christ, or his Apostles in Scripture.* Dr. Hamonds.

So that by all this evidence it appears, that Mr. *Wills* is so *Heterodox*, in both his *positions*, that he has neither *Scripture*, *Reason*, *Antiquity*, or the learned *Protestant* Writers, to stand by him therein. And wherein, if he persist, he gives up not only the *Independent*, but whole *Protes-* Mr. Wills his unreasonableness.

stant Cause, and all our *Reformation* at once; For what inventions in *worship* are their? that Men can impose, with any pretence to *Decency*, and *Order*, or *Analogy* to any of the Legal Rites, that may not be *introduced*, and given way too. And Doctor *Owin* adds: *That all the Superstitions, and Idolatryes; yea all the Confusion, Blood, and Persecution; yea all the Wars, that for so long a season have spread themselves over the face of the Christian World, have come in at this door.*

Resurrection proved by plain Scripture.

As to the two instances he gives, to justify himself herein, we say first, as to the *Doctrine* of the *Resurrection*, what is in more plain, and express *termes* delivered to us in the Scripture? and therefore we may the better admit of Consiquential *Reasoning*, in such truths, that are also plainly delivered to us, in expres termes else where.

Baptizing is Dipping in English.

And as for a plain word, to *dip* over *head*, and *ears*, the word it self doth it, because *Dipping*, or *Emerging*, as I make appear against Mr. *Wills's Sepistry*, signifies nothing else, but so puting the thing under *water*, as to cover it *all over*; and that not only by the most Eminent Criticks, but the constant usage of the word, both in the Old, and New Testament.

And as for the *Baptizing* with *Cloathes* on, as no Scripture mentions the putting *them off*, so the *light* of Nature *teacheth* there should be some on. And that the Cloathes are dipt matters not, so long as the Person is dipt, as all that experience it must needs acknowledge.

Consi-

Though as to plain *Consiquences*, and Scripture's

ture, *Reaſoning*, we admit, as well as they, provided we have all the parts of worſhip kept to expreſs words, and Goſpel *Ordinances aſſerted* by Goſpel *Inſtitutions*. And therefore we deny the inferences uſually drawn, from Circumciſion, under the Law, for Baptiſme, under the Goſpel, to be either plain, proper, or true.

quences from Circumciſion proved not Infants Baptiſme.

And becauſe Children were Circumciſed, under the Law, by an expreſs poſitive command, therefore that they may be *Baptiſed*, without any Precept, or command, under the Goſpel, holds not by any means. For though in ſome things Circumciſion, may have ſome analogy with Baptiſme, *viz.* in heart Circumciſion, or Mortification, muſt it therefore be good in all? it holds not. For though the *Ark*, as Doctor *Taylor* well obſerves, in ſome thing holds Analogy with Baptiſme, therefore to draw in all the Circumſtances, of the one, to the other, would make Baptiſme a *Prodegy*, not a rite; and therefore, ſaith he, Types, and Figures prove nothing, except ſome Command accompanyes. Had we as Expreſs a command to Baptize Children, under the Goſpel, as they to *Circumciſe* them, under the Law, it wou'd end the Controverſy; But as we have neither *Command* nor *Example*, as granted, ſo neither can there be any *Analogy*, either in *ſubject*, *qualification*, or *end*, as ſo largely proved: Not in *ſubject*, one being to be *Males* only in *Iſrael*; the other *Males*, and *Females* in all the World; Not in *qualification*, one to be the *Natural* Seed of *Abraham*,

brahams, without respect to Faith, and Repentance; the other the Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*, with respect to *Faith*, and *Repentance*; for that is *required* in all Persons that are to be *Baptised*, as so fully granted. Neither in the *ends*, the one to enter visibly into the *National Church* thereby; the other into the *Spiritual Church*, and to partake of *Spiritual Ordinances*, so entring also into *Covenant*, and acting Faith in the *Promises*, and *sharing* of *Priviledges*, in the very act of *entrance*, that no *Child*, under the *Law*, or *Gospel*, could be capable of.

In the next place, as to the *Antiquity* of enjoining Infants Baptisme, with all its impious *Concomitants*, of *Salt*, *Oyl*, *Spittle*, *Chrysme*, *Exorcisme*, *&c.* He grants it was not *till above four hundred years after Christ in the Milevitan, and Carthagenian Councels*; But withal saith, *the Reason why it was not enjoined sooner, was because the Lawfulness of it was rarely, if it all questioned before.*

A good grant from Mr. Wills for the witnesses against Infants Baptisme.

To which I say, then if it be so, that the *Canons* in the respective *Councels enjoining*, and *inforcing* Infants Baptisme, [*whereof, he saith, he hath above thirty to produce*] were only made upon the occasion of those that *denyed*, or *opposed* it: We have then our *Witnesses* throughout all Ages, confirmed by himself; yet with all I must *remember* him, presently, that though these first *Canons*, and those in other Centuries, were made against those that denyed Infants Baptisme, to curse, and Excommunicate, and destroy them,

yet

yet it was *denyed* long before any *Canons* were made to *impoſe* it.

And further he affirms. *That though Infants Baptiſme was not impoſed, before the fifth Century, yet that it was practiſed in the former Centuryes, from the Teſtimonyes of Juſtin Martyr, and Irenæus, Origen, and Cyprian.*

To which I ſay, that as to the *validity* of our Authors *teſtimonies*, as to the *practiſe* of Infants Baptiſme in the firſt *times*, we ſhall preſently *Examine*; though I deny not, but that it was diſcourſed before the third Century, and which appears, as I have owned, by *Tertullians* Reaſoning againſt it; but the thing I *affirm*, is that it is not *manifeſt* by any *Authentick Authority*, that it was *practiſed* as an Ordinance of Chriſt before; As Doctor *Barlow* ſo well obſerves, *viz. that he doth believe it came in, in the ſecond Century, (viz. in the Notion) and in the third, and fourth began to be practiſed, and defended to be lawful, by the Text groſly miſunderſtood* Jo. 3. 5.

No proof that Infants Baptiſme was practiſed in the 3. Century.

And as to the *Magdeburgs* themſelves, though they tell us, that from what they find from *Origen*, and *Cyprian*, concerning it, they conclude it was practiſed; and that many Superſtitious Rites in Baptiſme were alſo ſpoken of, in thoſe firſt Centuries: Yet do tell us withal in expreſs words, Century 3. ch. 6. p. 125. *Nec de ſuſceptione, de Baptiſmo, explicari quidquam inveniat, in omnibus hujus ſæculi, veris & probatis Scriptoribus: Neither can one find any thing ſpoken of, the Suſception of Baptiſme, in all the true, and approved Writers of this Age.* They tell us indeed, *of one*

only instance, mentioned by Vincentius, who wrote of the affairs of the Gallican Churches, mentioning a Family, that was Baptized, in the time of Aurelianus the Emperor, in which there was a Godly young man, by name Symphorianus, who was Baptised by Benignus the Presbyter; but with all they say of this Vincentius, Author non ita satis probatus: An Author not so well approved of.

Therefore till any instance be produced, of any Child that was Baptised as an Ordinance of Christ, within the first three hundred years, or towards the Conclusion of it, I am yet unreprovable in that my assertion; For if it should be taken for granted, that those four before mentioned had spoken of it, yet if they do not speak of the practice of it, which is all that I assert, I am very safe in what I have said.

Tradition the principal Ground, that hath been urged for Infants Baptisme.

2 Sect. Tradition the principal Ground upon which Infants Baptisme was founded Austin.

THe next thing to be enquired into, is the principal *Ground*, upon which Infants *Baptisme* was first *imposed*, and afterwards *established*, which I have made appear to be *humane*, or Unwritten *Tradition*, by divers Authorities, both Antient, and Moderne, p. 133.

Austin saith, That *Infants Baptisme is not to be believed, unless it were an Apostolical Tradition, &c.*

Bellarmin. *Bellarmin* tells us, *That it is an Apostolical Tradition not written, because (saith he) it is not written in any Apostolical Books, though in the Books of almost all the Antients, &c.*

Doctor

Doctor *Field*, That *Infants Baptisme is therefore called a Tradition, because it is not delivered in the Scriptures, that the Apostles did Baptize Infants, or that they should do so.* Dr. Field.

Convocation at Oxford, *That without the consentaneous ingagement, and practise of the Universal Church they should be at a loss when they are called upon for proof in the point of Infants Baptisme.* With divers others asserting the same, from pag. 133. to the 137.

To which Mr. *Wills* saith pag. 115. 122. *That it is a false suggestion, and exceeding all modesty, for although the Church of* Rome *ascribes too much to Tradition herein, making it equal with the Scripture; yet that the Antient Fathers do plead, that it comes in the room of Circumcision, and that Infants have right thereto, from the right that the Jews Infants had to Circumcision; And that the Protestants, when they use the word Tradition, do it as the Fathers before them, in sensu sano: in a wholesome sense, quite different from the corrupt sense of the Church of* Rome.

To which I say, though Mr. *Wills* affirms, there is such a vast *difference* betwixt the Church of *Rome*, and *them*, in the point of *Tradition*, about *Infants Baptisme*, wherein he owns them too corrupt; yet for my part I see not, as Mr. *Wills represents*, the Protestant sentiments about it, where the vast *difference* lyes, and what reason he hath to conclude, they themselves, that hold with the *Fathers* herein, are so *Orthodox*; and the Papists so *corrupt*, and Heterodox. Agreement betwixt Papist, & Protestant about the Tradition of Infants Baptisme.

For do the Church of *Rome* hold, that *it is an* 1. Papist a

Tradition not written.

Apostolical Tradition not written; there being nothing written of it in any Apostolical Book, but only found in the custom, and practise of the Church. Treat. Bap. p. 134.

Protestant an unwritten Tradition.

So doth Mr. *Wills* in behalf of the *Protestants* also *affirm*; *viz.* That *Infants Baptisme is therefore called a Tradition, because it is not expressly delivered in the Scripture, that the Apostles did baptize Infants, nor any expresse Precept they should do so: And that Tradition is the practise of such things, as are neither contained in Scripture expressly, nor the Examples of such practises expressly there delivered*, Mr. *Wills* p. 108.

2. Papists a Tradition gathered from the Scripture.

Do the Papists affirm: *That notwithstanding 'tis a Tradition, or Custom of the Church, yet that it is plainly enough gathered out of the Scriptures*; *viz. from Circumcision*, Bellarm. Tom. 3. L. 1. de Sacr. c. 8.

Protestant a Tradition gathered from the Scripture.

So doth Mr. *Wills* for the Protestants, say; *That notwithstanding, there is neither precept, nor practise, expressly written in the Scripture; yet it is gathered thence by good consequence, as coming in the Room of Circumcision; and therefore that Infants have a right to Baptisme, from the right that the Infants had to Circumcision*, Mr. *Wills* p. 105.

3. Papists that it is of equal Authority with Scripture.

Thirdly, *Do the Papists maintain, that the Ecclesiastical Tradition of Infants Baptisme (as it is gathered from the Scripture, and appointed by the Church) is of equal authority with the Scripture it self, and to be observed with the like holy reverence*, Treat. Bapt. p. 132.

Protestant of equal Authority

So doth Mr. *Wills* assert *for Protestant doctrine, That the Tradition of Infants Baptisme, proved by*

Con-

Consequential Arguments from the Scripture, ought to be esteemed as firm, and good as the Scripture it self, p. 117. In Scripture.

Do the Papists teach, *that Infants Baptisme was the appointment of Christ himself, and practise of the Apostles; though no mention, when it was given forth, nor when, and where practised*, Treat. Bap. 134. 4. Papists that the Church the subject, not Author.

So doth also Mr. *Wills* in the *name of the Protestants affirm, that Infants Baptisme was an Apostolical practise, and Ordinance, not that the primitive Church was the Author, but subject thereof, Christ himself having appointed it, and approved thereof*; (*though no where written*) p. 119. Protestant that the Church the subject, not the Author

Fifthly, Do the Papists maintain, *That the Truth of this Ecclesiastical Custom, of Infants Baptisme, is handed down to us, to be an Apostolical Tradition, by the writings of almost all the Antients*, Treat. Bap. p. 133. 5. Papists Testified by the Ancients.

So do also the *Protestant Pedobaptists* defend, *That the holy Ordinance of Infants Baptisme, hath been perpetually observed in the Christian Church; for there is no ancient Writer, that doth not acknowledge its Original from the Apostles*, Master *Wills* pag. 102, Protestant witnessed by all the Ancients.

So that by this *Parallel* we cannot find, where the great *difference* lyes, betwixt *Papists*, and *Protestants*: But if the Papists are corrupt in the point of *Tradition* about it, so are the *Protestants* also, being in so great an harmony therein together.

That the Papists, and many of the Protestants, do much accord in the point of Tradition about it,

it, is fully owned by Mr *Baxter*, in his Price of Love (as before.)

And that Mr. *Wills*, and other Protestants of his mind, do so too is *manifest*.

For all do harmoniously acknowledge, that *if it is not delivered in the Scripture, that the Apostles did Baptize Infants, or that there is any express precept there found, they should do so*, and therefore an Unwritten Tradition: Though the *Ground*, and *Reason* thereof (they say) *is fairly to be gathered by Consequence*, p. 507. which therefore must needs be the principal *Ground*, the *Ground* of the Ground; so that if the *Unwritten Tradition* prove a *mistake*, the pretended Scripture *Ground*, to justifie it, must needs be a *mistake* also: As for instance, the giving of the *Sacrament* to Infants, was asserted by the sayings of the *Antients*, to be an *Apostolical* unwritten *Tradition*, and so practised for many *Ages*, and this not without a pretended *Scripture* ground, to justify the said practise to be *good*, as Doctor *Barlow* observes from *John* 6 53. Which you have also urged by *Austin* himself, with great vehemency, as *necessary to Salvation*.

Communicating Infants is said to be an Apostolical Tradition as well as Infants Baptism.

Now this being since disowned, to be an Apostolical Tradition, which was the principal Ground, the Scripture urged to prove, and justify it, doth necessarely prove a *mistake*. And therefore (saith Doctor *Barlow*) *upon the like gross mistake, they did defend Infants Baptisme from John* 5. 3. *and he affirms, they may do ont, as well as the other.*

Therefore let all Men judge, whether Mr. *Wills*

Wills himself hath not *justified*, that he calls a false *suggestion*, and exceeding all *modesty*, to assert that Tradition, has been owned to be the principal Ground of Infants Baptisme: For take away the *Unwritten Tradition*, then the pretended Scriptures, to justify that, avail nothing.

It is true the *Papists* are larger, in the business of *Tradition* then the *Protestants*, and affirm a larger power, through their *Infallibility* to determine about it, then the *Protestants* can owne; who cannot only by their infallibility tell, what our Saviour said to *John*. lying in his bosom, but also what he told the Disciples in the Mount, not mentioned in the *Scripture*; And by the large trust committed to them, can *impose* those their *conclusions* as Oracles, and of like Autority with the *Scriptures*: As for instance, their *Chrysme*, *Exorcisme*, *Salt*, *Oyl*, *Spittle* (very antient Traditions, if not more ancient then Infants Baptisme it self) as Appendixes, if not essentials to Baptisme: And so *Altars*, *Copes*, *holy Water*, *Temples*, *Holy dayes*, with a vast number more of like kind, gathered also from Scripture *Analogy*, from Old Testament rites, as Infants *Baptisme* from Circumcision. And therefore do they reprove the Protestants, for not receiving all the rest, as well as *Infants Baptisme*, being all upon one bottom, *viz.* Apostolical *Tradition*, gathered from Scripture's *Consequence*.

The Papists are larger in point of Tradition then the Protestants.

The Fathers also herein, do seem to exceed the Protestants too (though Mr. *Wills* saith, they do so agree with them, in the point of Tradition, as holding it more soundly then the Papists)

The Fathers larger in point of Tradition

then the Protestants.

pists) *viz. Cyprian, Austin,* and others of the A tients, hold *Chrysme, Exorcisme,* Infants ri to the *Supper &c.* to be *Apostolical Traditio* and to be made good from Scripture *proof, Analogy*; And seem to be as large herein, as th *Papists* have since been: For instance, *Aus* in his 118. Epist. ad *Johan.* saith: *Illa quæ scripta, tradita custodimus, dantur vel Apost vel plenario Concilio, &c. The unwritten Tra tions, which we keep, are given by the Apost themselves, or general Councels, &c.*

Austin.

And amongst other things (with Infants Bap tisme) *he mentioneth the Solemnity of good Frida Easter-day, holy Thursday, and Wednesday*; he adds, *if any other thing hath occurred, which kept by the whole Church, where ever it spreads self.* This length our Pædobaptists cannot go with the *Fathers,* and *Papists* in other Traditions though they hold fast that of *Infants Baptis* with them, which was the main *Argument* it till *Luthers* time, as Mr. *Tombes* tells Mr. *Ba ster* in his third part of the Review, pag. 7 *Nor do I think Mr.* Baxter *can shew me one A ther, till* Luthers *day, who made Infants Bapt me, any other then an unwritten Tradition, though they produce many of them Scripture, the Necessity, Reasonableness, and Lawfulness the Church to use it, to whose authority they a too much, in the appointing such rites, and in preting Scriptures to that end, I do not find the engaged Papists cited by me, did set Tra above Scripture, but that they make it equal it, I grant, &c.*

The

Therefore since (by substantial Argument) *Tradition*, appears to be the *principal Ground*, and with so much confidence asserted, both by *Papists*, and *Protestants*, to be made good from the writings of all the Ancients (as saith *Calvin*) and *Bellarmine* (more modestly) by the writings of almost all the Antients; Let us therefore, in the next place, particularly examine the respective *Authorities* from Antiquity, avouched for the same; for if they fail, the whole *Fabrick* tumbles down. Here also:

The Antiquities urged by Mr. Wills, *to prove Infants Baptisme an Apostolical Tradition, disproved.* 3. Station.

THere are *five Authorities*, that have been usually brought to prove, Infants Baptisme an *Apostolical Tradition*, and the universal practice of the Church, which we have *examined* distinctly, and given an Account of the *insufficiency*, and *weakness*, if not the *wickedness*, of most of them, and which appearing *false*, all the rest depending upon them, necessarely fall to the Ground. 5. Authorities to prove Infants Baptisme Traditional.

The first three of them, *viz. Dionysius the Areopagite*, in the first *Century*; the *Decretals of the first Popes*; *or Roman Bishops*, with *Justin Martyrs Responses*, in the second *Century*, are all of them owned by Mr. *Wills* to be *spurious*, and *suppositious*; though to this day leaned upon, by most of the Popish, and many *Protestant* Writers also; whereby the Mystery of Iniquity did 3. of them owned to be spurious.

early discover it self, not only to *usher in*, but to support this Innovation, by Lyes, and Forgeries.

But Mr. *Wills* tells us, that though these are forgeries, yet *Justin* Martyrs Dialogue to *Tryphon*, is *genuine*, *who therein saith, that it was lawful for all to receive the Spiritual Circumcision* [viz. Baptisme] *whereby it may well be inferred, saith Mr.* Wills *from Mr.* Baxter, *that all may receive it, then Infants, who were the Subjects of Legal Circumcision, for they must be part of all, and not excluded*, Wills 128.

Justin Martyr to Tryphon examined.

Which I say, is a meer *impertinency*, and nothing to the purpose.

For first, here is not one word of *Infants*, nor of Infants Baptisme, or its Apostolicalness.

Secondly, it is very *absurd* (the better to hook in Children) to interprete the word [*all*] to be all Men, for if all Men, then it must comprehend wicked, as well as good; Believers, as well as Unbelievers, and which (*as confined to Baptisme*, by Master *Wills*) is to contradict Christs Commission, and the Apostles practise, who limited it only to those, that repented of their Sins, and believed the Gospel. And though it is true, the Gospel was to be preached to all, and all of all Nations, in distinction to the Notion of the Jews, who only were concerned in the first Commission; yet only they taught *Believers* amongst them, were to be *Baptised*; not the ignorant, and *prophane*; And if the word *All*, be so to be understood, it is a witness *for us*, not them, for Infants thereby are excluded, who

are neither capable of Inſtruction, Repentance, or Faith. And that it is ſo to be underſtood, let *Juſtin* himſelf be the *Interpreter*, who not only in his *Apology*, before mentioned, tells us, that they **Only**, who *were inſtructed in the Faith, and believed, were brought to Baptiſme, to have their new Birth perfected.* But in this *very Dialogue to Tryphon*, tells us, *that by the Word, and Baptiſme, Regeneration was* **perfected**, *in all mankind*, (*viz.* in all that did hear, and receive the word, and were capable to come to Baptiſme.) *And again, that by the grace of God, and the Baptiſme of Repentance, ſins were expiated*, as Magdeburgs Cent. 2. pag. 47. *which ſufficiently declares, that this is nothing to the purpoſe, except it be to confirm Believers Baptiſme only.*

Juſtin himſelf contradicts Mr. Willsſenſe

And to which ſaith Mr. *Tombes*; This *teſtimony for Antiquity of Infants Baptiſme, I remember not alledged by any before Mr.* Baxter, *and therefore, beſides the impertinency of the words, as he himſelf alledgeth them, I ſee no need to ſearch further into it*, Review 2. part p. 71.

Mr. Baxters ſingular Notion.

In the next place Mr. *Wills* tells us of an other Antiquity, to prove Infants Baptiſme *Apoſtolical*, viz. *Iraeneus*, who in Lib. 2. c. 39. Adverſ. Hæreſ. tells us, *that Chriſt did ſanctifie every age, by his own ſuſception of it, and ſimilitude to it. All I ſay, who by him are born again to God*: Whereby (*ſaith Mr.* Wills) *we infer, that being born again to God, ſignifying Baptiſme, as the Antients for the moſt part took it, then were the Infants baptiſed in his day*, Wills p. 129.

Irenæus teſtimony examined.

To which I reply, that if this be any more

the purpose then the former, let all Men judge; and whether it be not far *fetch'd*, and unnaturaly *screwed*, without either Reason, or truth?

Very impertinent. For first, here is not one word of *Infants Baptisme*, or its *Apostolicalness*, and nothing but an *impertinent* begging *Question* upon *Question*, to make up an *inference*.

Secondly, The Interpretation upon which it is founded, is wholy *falacious*, for neither the *Scriptures*, nor *Justin Martyr*, do call Baptisme *Regeneration* absolutely, but only as it is the Symbole of *Regeneration*, already wrought by the word, and so *Justins* words *before import*, and that only respecting the *Adult*; that were capable thereof: For if this be true *Doctrine*, then must all Hypocrits, and wicked Men, that either now, or ever were Baptised, be actually thereby Regenerated, and so consequently saved; which is so absurd, and Ridiculous, as nothing can be more. To which Mr. *Tombes* has so well answered Mr. *Baxter* in his third Review, pag. 79. (And which was never yet replyed to) that we need say no *more* to it, *viz.*

Mr. Tombes. But *Christ was not in his Age, an Example of every age by his Baptisme, as if he did by it sanctify every age, for then he should have been baptised in every age; but in respect to the holyness of his humane Nature, which did remain in each age, and so exemplarily sanctify every age to God, so as that no age but was capable of holiness, by conformity to his Example. Now if the meaning were, that Christ came to save all that were baptised by him, or by his appointment, then he came to save* Simon Magus

Magus, *and who ever are, and have been baptiſed rightly*, Judas *himſelf*. *Therefore ſuch a ſenſe is moſt palpably falſe, and therefore is this wreſted by the Pædobaptiſts, againſt its meaning, to prove Infants Baptiſme in his time.*

So that I hope it will be manifeſt, that theſe Authorities are as little to the purpoſe, as the three former, and all though theſe are not *Suppoſititions*, yet wholy *inſignificant*, and nothing to the purpoſe.

Whereby it is manifeſt, that for the firſt *two hundred years* we have not the leaſt *proof*, by any Authentick *Author*, that Infants Baptiſme was an *Apoſtolical Tradition*, or that it was once practiſed within that compaſs of time. And therefore ſaith Doctor *Barlow*, *I believe, and know that there is, neither precept, nor practiſe in Scripture for Pædobaptiſme; nor any juſt evidence for it, for above two hundred years after Chriſt.* And may it not be very well concluded, in Mr. *Baxters* words about *Confirmation*, *That it was very ſuſpicious, to find in* Juſtin Martyrs *Deſcription of the Chriſtian Churches practiſe, no mention of it*, p. 128. So neither to find in *Juſtin Martyr*, nor, as Mr. *Tombes* well obſerves, the leaſt of it in *Euſebius, Ignatius, Clemens Alexandrinus, Athanaſius*, or *Epiphanius*, is very good ground to *conclude againſt it*, and reproof to Mr. *Calvin*, who *ſaith, that there is no Antient Writer, that doth not acknowledge, the Original of the holy Ordinance of Infants Baptiſme, even from the Apoſtles. And to Mr.* Marſhal *alſo, who ſaith that the Church hath been in poſſeſſion of Infants Baptiſme this fivteen hundred*

Dr. Barlow.

Mr. Calvin and Mr. Marſhal juſtly reproved.

years, and that no one Authority can be found witnessing thereto, for two hundred years after Christ.

Origen's testimony tryed.

But in *the next place, with greater confidence,* saith Mr. *Wills, we adhear to* Origen, *notwithstanding the frivelous cavils of the Author.* It is true, *Origen* is the Authority especially *gloried* in, as being so positive, and expres's for its Apostolicalnes's, as it is mentioned *L. 5. ad Rom. c. 6. and confirmed in Lev. l. 8. Hom. 8. and in Luke Hom. 14.* In these words, *the Church hath received a Tradition from the Apostles, to give Baptisme to Children (who had the secret Mystery of Divine things committed to them) because they being defiled with the pollution of sin, ought to be washed, or cleansed by the water, and Spirit, &c.*

To which we have said these three things, viz.

Reason given before againdst it in Treat. of Baptisme.

"First, *that* Origen *is but one single testimony,* "(as Doctor *Tayler* observes) *and that against* "*so much authentick testimonie to the contrary, that* "*none but the Aduls are found in the Apostles times,* "*and the next Century after them, to be baptised.*

"Secondly, *that his writings are so notorious* "*corrupt, and erronious, and particularly in the* "*point of Baptisme.*

"Thirdly, *that many of his* Books, *and par-* "*ticularly these that treat of Baptisme, fell into such* "*ill hands.*

Mr. Wills answer to the first.

To which Mr. *Wills* answers, First, *that* Origen *was not a single testimony, because, saith he, we have the testimony of* Irenæus *also.* But what *Irenæus* Testimony signifies you have heard; and therefore that neither *Irenæus*, or any other but *Ori-*

Origens Testimony was in the Case, you have Doctor *Tayler* in his Deswasive against Popery, 2. part pag. 118. printed 1667, one of his last pieces, saying thus: *That there is Tradition to baptise Infants, relyes but upon two witnesses, Origen, and Austin, and the latter having received it from the former, it relyes wholy upon a single Testimony, which is but a pittiful Argument, to prove a Tradition Apostolical; he is the first that spoke it: but* Tertullian, *that was before him, seems to speak against it, which he would not have done, if it had been a Tradition Apostolical. And that it was not so, is but too certain, if there be any truth in the words of* Ludov. Vives, *saying, that anciently none were baptised, but persons of riper age.* Dr. Tayler that Origen was but a single Testimony.

And herein the Doctor, it must be granted, speaks his own sense, not playing the Anabaptist, as 'tis said he did in his Liberty of Prophecy.

To the Second, he owns his *corruptions, and great errors*, but saith to ballance him, that *Tertullian* did not come much short of him, in error, and corruption; that is one of my witnesses. Mr. Wills grants the 2.

To which I say, let them then go together, only I shall have thereby the better bargain for Mr. *Wills*, in parting with *Origen* parts with all, but I have many more to witness for me besides.

To the Third, that his *Homelies on the Romans, were all translated by* Ruffinus, *is my mistake, for though* Ruffinus *might abuse some part of* Origens *works, yet that* Jerom *did translate his Romans, and* Mr. Wills to the 3. chargeth me with mistake.

and Luke also; and which *he saith*, *appeareth by* Jeroms *Preface*, *affixed to them as* Erasmus, (he tells us) *confesseth*, *and therefore*, *though* Ruffinus *hath no credit with me*, *he hopes* Jerom *may*, *they being* Jeroms *Version*, *and which upon* Erasmus *testimony puts it beyond all doubt.*

Reply to the charge wherein Mr. Wills appears to be greatly mistaken.

To which I say, first, that what ever good thoughts Mr. *Wills* hath of the *Translation* of the *Romans*, yet Mr. *Perkins* is pleased, as I told him; to put it amongst his spurious works.

Secondly, that *Erasmus* (what ever Mr. *Wills* so falsly tells us) is so far from asserting the *Romans* to be *Jeroms*, and not *Ruffinus*. that he saith just the contrary, in his Centure before *Origens* works, in these words: *At qui legit enarrationem Epistolæ (ad Hebræos) Romanos est utrum legit* Origenem, *an* Ruffinum: *And he that reads his Commentaires upon the Epistle to the Romans, is uncertain whether he reads* Origen, *or* Ruffinus.

But is not *Jeroms* Preface before the Epistle? and doth not *Erasmus* tell us so, to put us beyond all doubt? It is true, Mr. *Wills* indeed tell us so; but what credit is to be given to him, let all Men judge, when *Erasmus*, and *Grynæus* also, tell us the quite contrary? *Erasmus* his words are these: *Hic Librarii magnifice perfricuere frontem, & in Præfatione, & in per Orationi pro* Ruffino, Hieronymum *supponentes, hoc est vitrum pro Gemma Lectori obtrudere conantes, & hactenus sane fefellerunt incautos, nam Præfatio poterat utcunque videri* Hieronymi; *sed in per Oratione quasi Sorices suo se produnt indicio*: *Herein the Booksellers have been very impudent, both in the Preface, and con-*

Erasmus detects the cheat.

concluſion alſo, putting Jerom *inſtead of* Ruffinus, *that is to ſay, endeavouring to obtrude upon the Reader. Glaſs inſtead of a Jewel, and hitherto indeed they have deceived the unwary: For however, the Preface may ſeem* Jeroms, *yet in the per-oration (or concluſion) the Rats do as it were betray themſelves by their own diſcovery.* In like manner (as ſaith the ſame Author) *Quod idem factum eſt in Symbolo: Eum enim librum in* Cypriani *nomen transtulerunt, ſed ita multis commutatis, ut ipſa res clamitet non caſu, ſed de induſtria factum eſſe: The ſame thing is done in the Symbolum: For they transferred that Book on the name of* Cyprian, *but many things being ſo changed, that the matter it ſelf manifeſts ſufficiently, that it was done not by chance, but of deſign.*

But then ſaith Mr. Wills, *what do you ſay to* Luke? *For it is to be noted, that neither the Author, nor any one elſe, hath any thing to ſay againſt his* Homelies *on Luke (what ever they have to ſay, on that on the Levit. and the Romans) where* Origen *expreſſeth the ſame thing, concerning Infants Baptiſme, and Mr.* Perkins *himſelf lets this paſs without the Cenſure of being ſpurious*, p. 132. Origen upon Luke examined.

To which I anſwer, Firſt, then it is not denyed, but that *Leviticus*, wherein is the ſame thing aſſerted, is ſo ſpoiled by *Ruffinus*, that it may be juſtly cenſured, for Mr. *Wills ſaith nothing* to it, and if he did, it is all one, for *Eraſmus* is as poſitive for that, as for the other. 1. No Original Copy of it.

And as for that of *Luke*, Mr. *Tombes* obſerves in his *third Review*, pag. That *Eraſmus* ſaith on *Luke* 1. 3. *Sic enim viſus eſt ſentire, quis is fuit,* Tombes.

cujus extant in Lucam *Commentarii Adamantii titulo: For ſo he ſeems to think whoſoever he was, whoſe Commentaries are extant upon* Luke, *under the title of Adamantius which ſhews (ſaith he) that* Eraſmus *took them not to be* Origens, *or at leaſt doubted thereof.*

Voſſius. And *Voſſius Diſputatio* 14. Sect. 8. p. 181. *ſaith thus* (having cited *Origens whole* teſtimony out of *Luke*, &c.) *Sed de* Origene *minus laborabimus, quia qua citabimus Græce non extant: But we care the leſs for* Origens, *becauſe the things we cited, are not extant in the Greek.*

Sculletus. And *Sculletus* in his *Medul. Pat.* L. 6. c 2. *Cum Græca Originis Opera non extant hodie, & quibus Latina verſio corrigi poſſit, & emendari:* That *Origens works in Greek were not at preſent extant, by which the Latin verſion might be corrected, and amended.*

Eraſmus. And Eraſmus: *Atque utinam extarent Græca* Originis *monumenta, quo* Ruffinicas *artes poſſemus deprehendere:* And *I wiſh that the Greek Copies of* Origen *were extant, that ſo we might thereby diſcover the cheats of* Ruffinus.

2. Origen was more a Pelagian then to aſſert Original ſin.

But Secondly, there is good Reaſon to *queſtion, that thoſe* things about Infants *Baptiſme, were not Origens*, from the Reaſons that is added to them, *viz. to take away Original Sin*; whereas it is ſo well known, that *Origen* was not only a great *Arian*, but the very Fountain, and head of them, as *Jerom, and Epiphanius, calls him* Magdeb. Century 3. p. 261. &c. But *notoriouſly did deny Original ſin*, as pag. 265. And therefore doth Doctor *Owin*, in his diſplay of *Arianiſme*

niſme ch. 12. ſay *Nor did* Origen *Pelaginiſe a little only, but is ſuppoſed firſt to have brought Pelaginiſme into the Church.*

And therefore doth *Voſſius* in his Hiſtory of Pelaginiſme L. 4. Th. 6. pag. 153. *So much Queſtion, whether thoſe paſſages in his works, mentioning Infants Baptiſme, could be his, upon the account of Pelaginiſme.*

By all which I doubt not, but that the judicious Reader will conclude, there is a good Ground, to judge this Teſtimony of *Origens*, upon all theſe Accounts, to be as invallid, and inſignificant, as the *former*; and that as yet we have not the leaſt evidence, to prove this our unwriten *Tradition* to be Apoſtolicall.

Cyprians teſtimony examined.

The Laſt, and chiefeſt, that is pretended to warrant this an Apoſtolick Tradition, is that of *Cyprian*, in his, and his 66. Biſhops Epiſtle to *Fidus*, (who is placed by *Uſher* in the middle of the third Century, 250.) wherein it is ſaid to this purpoſe, *viz.*

An Epitomy of his Epiſtle.

That *it ſeemed good, not only to himſelf, but a whole Councel, that Infants might be baptiſed before the eight day; & the Reaſons to inforce it are theſe that Follow.* Firſt, *Becauſe the Baptiſme was ſimpely neceſſary to Salvation.* Secondly, *That it waſhes away Original Sin, ſo as it is never to be imputed more.* Thirdly, *Becauſe the Grace of God is tendered to all, therefore all Children ſhould be baptiſed.* Fourthly, *Becauſe Children have leſſer ſins then others, and ſo they need leſs pardon then Men of grown years, therefore leſs hindrance in them, to come to Gods grace.* Fifthly, *Becauſe in their firſt*

birth they do nothing, but pray by their crying, and weeping. Sixthly, *Because the Soul, that is not baptised, is loſt.* Cypr. l. 3. Ep. 8.

Againſt which I gave in three Exceptions.

Former Exceptions.

"*Firſt*, Becauſe Infants Baptiſme is not hereby "urged, for an Apoſtolical Tradition, nor upon any "Authority of Scripture, but upon his own, and "Biſhops Arguments (as ſaid) ſuch as they are "to inforce it, though if he ſhould have ſaid, it "was an Apoſtolical Tradition, his word would "no more have been taken, then when he tells "us, *Chriſme*, and other inventions were ſo too.

"*Secondly*, Becauſe there is ground to Que-"ſtion, whether there was any ſuch Councel: "Firſt, Becauſe there is no place mentioned, "where ſuch a Councel was kept. Secondly, "the grounds are ſo weak, and erroneous. Third-"ly, Becauſe it was a doctrine ſo much contra-"dicted by his great Maſter *Tertullian*. Fourth-"ly, Becauſe there were many things fathered "upon him, not his.

"*Thirdly*, That if it did truly appear to be "his, yet there was as little ground to receive it "upon his word, as the reſt of his corrupt, erro-"neous, and Antichriſtian doctrines, vented by "him, whereof you have ſome account from the "*Magdeburgs* in his Nævi.

Mr. Wills anſwer to the firſt.

To the firſt he ſays, though he did not ſay, it was an Apoſtolical Tradition, it follows not that he did not ſo own it, the Magdeburgs *ſay that he did ſo affirm it.*

Reply.

To which I ſay, that in *proof* of Apoſtolical Tradition, it is neceſſary to bring ſuch only, that

that upon *warrantable* ground are poſitive in it; For this at the beſt can be urged, but as a *conſequential proof*, and far fetcht too; *viz.* Becauſe *Cyprian* in his time gave his *opinion* for it, therefore it was *practiſed* in that age, and becauſe it was practiſed, two hundred & fifty years after Chriſts time, therefore it was the practice of the *Apoſtles*, which if allowed, would be excellent *authority*, for all the Superſtitious obſervations of *Chryſme*, *Exorciſme*, and an hundred more of thoſe knacks.

But he tells us, the *Magdeburgs ſay, that Cyprian affirmed, it was ſo.* And that is juſt as much as if Mr. *Wills* ſhould ſo *affirm*, except ſome antient, and authentick *authority* be produced for the ſame; and it is not yet evidenced, out of his writings, that he any where ſaith ſo.

"But as to what I ſay, that if *Cyprian* had "any where upon his own word told *us*, it had "been an *Apoſtolical* Tradition, yet it would have "ſignified as little, as his *telling* us, that Chryſme was ſo. He replyed: Mr. Wills Anſwer to the 2. part of the firſt

And doth not the ſame exception lye againſt Tertullian, *who as the Magdeburgs tell us, was the inventer of Chryſme, and therefore (ſays he) is ſuch inflexibleneſs, ſtifneſs, and partiality, fair, and equal?*

To which I ſay, *If Tertullian, his Maſter*, was the *inventer* of *Chryſme*, which *Cyprian* calls an *Apoſtolical Tradition*, what credit then is to be given to his *teſtimony*, that dares to avouch ſo fearfull a lye ſo knowingly. Reply.

Secondly, If he ſhould tell us, upon his own *word*, two hundred years after, that both were

Apo-

Apoſtolical, we have great reaſon to diſtruſt, that of Infants *Baptiſme*, when we know the other is a manifeſt Falſhood.

Neither is there the like *reaſon*, to reject *Tertullians* Teſtimony againſt *Infants Baptiſme*: Firſt, becauſe it is only urged as matter of *Fact*, that Infants Baptiſme was denyed by him, to be an *Ordinance* of *Chriſt*, the verity whereof (I think) never any *doubted*, with the Reaſons he gives for the ſame, in his Book de *Baptiſmo*, as Doctor *Barlow*, and Doctor *Taylor*, ſo fully acknowledge: Had he indeed told us, that two hundred years before him (without any proof, but his own ſay ſo) ſome of the Apoſtles had denyed it, and at the ſame time told us, a manifeſt lye of them alſo, there had been, the like cauſe to have queſtioned his evidence: And as to *Tertullians* teſtimony, ſo much *contemned* by Mr. *Wills*, you ſhall hear more of it in the next *Chapter*, where my witneſſes are *vindicated*, againſt his Cavils.

Mr. Wills to the 2. To the ſecond *Exception*, as to the three Grounds I urge, why no ſuch Councel? He firſt *anſwers* with a ſcoff (*And that is ſtrange for one that hath launcht out, as he hath done, into the vaſt Ocean of Antiquity*) then gives the reaſon, why he judges there was ſuch a Councel, *becauſe ſo many (in the Fourth, & fifth Century) of the Fathers*, (ſome of whom he mentions from Doctor *Hamond*) *had ſuch a venerable eſteem for it*. But what then?

That is no Argument, it was a *Decree* of ſuch a *Councel*, becauſe ſo many had a good *eſteem* of

of it: For all the same Fathers, he mentions, esteemed very well of *Chrysme*, and *Exorcisme*, &c. asserted by *Cyprian*; Doth it therefore follow they were appointed by him in *Councel*, and to be *received* therefore by them, and all others, without *further* dispute. But that *Cyprians* Dictates were not so *authentick* among the *Antients*, may appear by their universally *rejecting*, his *Doctrine* of *Rebaptisation*, though determined in an undoubted Councel, at *Carthage* in *Affrica*, under *Gallus*, mentioned in his Epistle to *Jubajanus*, and in all his Epistles, *Magdeb.* Century 3. pag. 194. And that *novel opinion* of his, about *sprinkling* also, in his Epistle to *Magnus*, L. 4. Ep. 7. which all of them *declined* for so many Ages. Magdeb Cent. 3. p. 194.

As to the other three Arguments, against the *Councel*, he saith nothing at all; Neither doth he say one word against those *childish, erroneous, and ridiculous grounds*, the (supposed) learned *Councel* gives for that their *opinion*, which I urge in the third *Reason*: Onely he *Cavils* with me for the Argument I urge from *Austins* Confession against this Councel, *viz.* that it had not been determined in any *Councel*, saying, *that it is a pitiful mistake, and misunderstanding of* Austins *words; who saith: Who had not its first institution from some Councel.* To which I say, the words are: *Nec Conciliis institutum: Neither instituted, or decreed in Councels.* There is no first: So that he did certainly, by these words, conclude against any *institution*, or Determinaiton, in this, as well as any other *Councel*; and this to be sure, if Reply nothing to the third.

if it be not in this *supposed Councel*, of *Cyprian determined, and instituted*, he finds it no where else (this being the first Councel, that ever is pretended to mention it, and excepting *Origen* he particularizeth, no authority higher. *Austins* words run thus: *That which the Church* (*viz.* in his time) *held, and which had neither been instituted* (in Cyprians, nor) *in other Councel* (so concluding against all Councels) *and which was always held* (yet gives no higher account, to prove that universal Tenet then *Origen*) *must therefore be an Apostolical Tradition.* A notable convincing Argument no doubt, and so far from being next to *Demonstration*, as Mr. *Wills* fondly asserts, that it is next to *nothing*, and just as good, and *authentick*, as *Austins* assertion, that *the giving the Sacrament to Children, was Apostolical, and necessary to Salvation.*

And then in Mr. *Philpots* words he tells us, because we deny this of *Cyprian*, to be good proof *That the verity of Antiquity is with them, and that the Anabaptists have nothing, but lyes for them, and their new imaginations, which feign that Baptisme of Children is the Popes commandement.*

To which I say that what ever Mr. *Philpot* (that worthy Martyr) might *heretofore* in ignorance *affirm*, and Mr. *Wills* may now, with so much *prejudice*, repeat and *second*; Yet he must pardon us if we say: That until as full a *Command* from Christ, be produced for *Infants Baptisme*, as is from the *Pope* for the same, that the *lye he talks of*, will certainly rest at their door, who with so much *confidence* assert, that it was Christs *precept*,

cept, and the Apostles practise, and yet are able to bring no more from Scripture, or Antiquity, to warrant it, whileſt all that *full-mouthed*, and *undenyable evidence*, from the Popes *Canons*, and *Decrees*, are manifested by us for the same.

But if it should be granted Mr. *Wills*, that this of *Cyprians* Decree was *authentick*, and that there was then a *Determination*, to baptise all *Children* upon the Reasons, and Grounds mentioned therein (*viz.* because *Gods grace was tendered to all*. Secondly, *Because Children were more capable of it, then grown Men*. Thirdly, *Because it was necessary to Salvation*. Fourthly, *Because so available to wash away Original sin*. Fiftbly, *Because they do nothing, but pray when they cry, in the first birth*. And Sixthly, *Because they would otherwise be lost*) what would it avail to prove, that their Infants Baptisme that Mr. *Wills* pleads for, was an Apostolical Tradition, or practised in those first times? For Mr. *Wills renounceth* this as *erronous*, and *false*, as we do his, who is neither for the *baptizing* of all *Children*, nor upon those *grounds asserted*, which he *reprobates*, as Popish, and *Ridiculous*: And therefore *Protogenes* his schaeme for *baptizing Children*, to cure diseases, might as well have been *produced* by Mr *Wills* as *Cyprians* model to save their *Souls*, and both like significant to what Mr. *Wills pleads for*. It is true this supposed Decree of *Cyprians* was the true pattern, that those first Popish *Councels* wrote after, and which the *Papists* have followed ever *since*, and who therefore do as much *renounce* Mr. *Wills* Infants Baptisme, as he doth *theirs*, upon which score it

was

it was that the *Latins* counted the Baptisme of the *Greek Church* a *nullity*, and did rebaptise those again, as the *Greeks* did theirs. And therefore is *Calvin*, & *Luther*, and those that made the first *change*, from the old *pattern*, put by the Popish Writers amongst those, that *positively* denyed Infants Baptisme, for they conclude that they had as good *deny* it, as so to alter the *Ceremonial* form, and change the ends thereof; So that if Mr. *Wills seeks* for *Antiquity*, for the Baptisme of the *Infants* of *Believers* only, he cannot go higher then *Luther* or *Zwinglius*, as Mr. Tombes observes, and if for the Children only of *Inchurched Parents*, (which I conceive to be his judgement) he cannot *extend* it higher then the *New England pattern*, about forty, or fifty years since.

Thus it is *manifest* to you, first, that there is neither *Precept*, nor *Example*, in Scripture for *Infants Baptisme*, as is so fully *acknowledged*. *Secondly*, That the *Scriptures silence*, or its not *forbidding*, cannot justify any thing in *Gods worship*, and that nothing but an express *Scripture* that carries, thus saith the *Lord Jesus* along with it, can free any from *Superstition* & false worship; which fully *excludes* Infants Baptisme by their own *Grant*, Mr. *Wills acknowledging* (*they cannot say*), *thus saith the Lord Jesus, Baptize your Children.* And *thirdly*, It is as fully *manifested*, that the pretended *Antiquity*, for the practise of Infants *Baptisme* fails; none proving it *higher* by any approved *Author*, then the fourth, or fifth Century: And then no other Baptisme, then hath been *renounced by most Protestants*, as corrupt, and *erroneus*; And that how-

however the *Papists*, and those that go their way, may prove *Antiquity* as high as the fourth, or fifth *Century*: Yet that Mr. *Wills* can go no higher for his, then *New England*, or at the furthest then *Luther*.

CHAP. III.

Wherein the Witnesses against Infants Baptisme, are vindicated from Mr. Wills *Exceptions.*

THe *Witnesses* produced by me, against *Infants Baptisme*, were either particuler *Persons*, or *Churches*, as you have them at large mentioned in the seventh Chapter.

And first, as to the evidence from particuler Persons, Mr. *Wills* in his Preface tells us: *That notwithstanding all the flourishes Mr.* D. *makes, and the numerous Quotations, he hath fetcht from the Magdeburgensian History, in his seventh Chapter, from the first Century, to the end of the twelfth, there are but two Persons, to be found against Infants Baptisme, viz.* Adrianus, *and* Hinemarus, *which is just the same Number*, he was pleased to allow me before, for Believers Baptisme: But whether these, and their *fellows*, may not *speed*, as well as the former, shall be put to as fair a trial, and so submitted to judgement.

1. From particuler Persons.

Mr. Wills ownes but two in the whole.

"The first of my Witnesses, urged against In- Tertullian
"fants Baptisme, was *Tertullian*, who doth, as the first
"expressed pag. 221. *eminently* oppose it, in six witness.
"Arguments: First, from the *mistaken Scrip-*

"ture, *Matt.* 19. 14. suffer little Children, &c. (by which it seems some would have introduced such a practise) which could not, as he saith, be properly applyed to Infants Baptisme, for several Reasons urged from their incapacities. Secondly, from the *weightiness* of that *Ordinance*, which required *Caution*, and *consideration*, and no such haste. Thirdly, from the *sinfulness* of such a *practice*, by Prophaning an *Ordinance*, and partaking of *others* sins. Fourthly, from the *absurdity* of such a practise, in *refusing* to intrust them *with Earthly things*, *and yet commit Spiritual things to their trust*. Fifthly, from the *Folly* of exposing *witnesses*, propounded it seems, to supply the want of *capacity* in them, and to *undertake* for them. Sixthly, from the consideration that the Adult, upon many *considerations*, *were the only proper Subjects of Baptisme*. And to which we may add a Seventh (which he is pleased (so falsly) to say, I purposly, and subtilly omitted, there being no cause for it, that I know) *viz.* From the insignificancy of the end propounded for the same, *viz. To take away sin from Children.*

Mr. Williams owns Tertullians wit.

To which testimony, in the First place, he gives us this acknowledgement, pag. 96. *viz. That it is acknowledged that* Tertullian, *who was the first Writer of note in the Latin Church, hath divers passages seemingly against Infants Baptisme, but yet withal it must be considered, that his Testimony (such as it is) is but the testimony of one single Dr. in opposition to the general custom of the Church.*

Where-

Where by the way, we may take notice, that our *witness* is owned by him, but the general *custom* of the *Church*, he speaks of, is yet to be *proved* as utterly *disowned* by us, and for which there is not the least *colour* of truth as yet produced.

And again pag. 6. he doth grant, *That the Magdeburgs do indeed tell us, that Tertullian in the third Age, opposes himself to some that asserted Infants Baptisme, affirming that the Adult were the only proper Subjects of Baptisme.* But what a corrupt Person he *was*, and how *weak* he had *Reasons*, he endeavors with much keenness to demonstrate.

Charges him with corruption, and weakness.

In answer whereto I say, that his *witness* being *allowed*, and to be such a Doctor of *Note* too in the Latin *Church*, it is sufficient; and I think, we need say nothing to those *cavils* of *corruption* and weakness, the evidence being acknowledged, (the main thing intended) and which will be endless to answer, in every Authority that may be urged *pro*, and *con*.

But yet in as much as he is our first *witness*, and speaks so much *Reason*, and *truth*, and so much to the *purpose*; And to make Mr. *Wall* his unreasonable *opposition*, the better to appear, we shall give some distinct *reply*, to his *Exceptions* against this our *witness*, whom he *weigheth* for so much *corruption* in Doctrine, and *folly* in this his particuler witness.

And first, for that great *corruption* in Doctrine, he charges him with, about *Chrysme*, *Exorcisme*, &c. I presume there are none of his ancient Doc-

1. The corrupt Doctrine he charges

Tertullian with.

ctors comes short of him, and who were as much Montanists as he therein, *viz. Origen. Cyprian. Chrysostom, Austin, &c.* only herein *Tertullian* was more Orthodox, holding none of those to be *Jure Divino*, whilest they took them to be Apostolical Traditions, and essential to Baptisme, *Magdeb.* Century 3. chap. 10. pag. 240. compard. 82. 225. 248. And for those evil *sentiments* of God, and Christ, it is certain that *Origen* did far exceed him, as you will find at large in his *Navi*, pag. 261. &c. and which *argues* a very *partial mind* to be so quick sighted in the one, and so stark blind in the other. And as to his being a *Montanist*, before he wrote his Book of *Baptisme*, which Mr. *Wills* affirms, I see it not confirmed by any good *Authority*, the *Magdeburgs* tell us, that from *Carthage*, he went to *Rome*, and lived long there, where he wrote against the *Montanists*, and wrote his Book of *Prescriptions*, as *Helvicus* saith, the fifth of *Severus*, which Mr. *Wills* ownes to be about the *fortyth* year of his age: And the said *Helvicus* tells us, that it was twenty years after, before he wrote fore the *Montanists*. And he that writes the lives of the Primative Fathers, pag. 82. tells us, that in the eleventh year of *Severus*. *Tertullian* wrote his Book of Baptisme, against *Quintilla* in his third Tome next to his Prescriptions, and in the fiveteenth year, his Book of the Resurrection, &c. But if he was turned *Montanist* before, the matter is not much, for it must be owned, that a Man that is *erroneous* in one thing may be *Orthodox* enough in another: The business is,

Tertullian no Montanist before he wrote so: Baptisme.

is, whether as to matter of fact, he spoke these things against Infants *Baptisme*, and that is not denyed: And in the next *place*, whether he spoke not *reason*, and *truth*, in that his *testimony*, which in the next place we shall *examine*.

Therefore Secondly, as to the *weakness* of his Argument, which he renders so *contemptible*, and *ridiculous*, and guilty of so much *dotage*, I make the following particuler reply to each *exception*, *viz.*

First, as to his first Argument, from the mistaken Scripture, *he saith, he abuseth the Text by his Paraphrases.* But second thoughts will I presume, tell him, it is no *abuse*, but a very *proper* answer to them, that would make the word Come in the Text; to be a *coming* to Baptisme; which, saith he, cannot be, *because Children cannot come to that Ordinance, till they are Elder, till they know, and are taught, why they come, &c. Will you have them made Christians, before they know Christ?* Are what could be spoken more *full*, and *pertinent*, and more *agreeable* to truth? 1. He abused not the Text Mat. 19. 14.

Secondly, From his advising *caution*, and *consideration*, from the weightiness of the *Ordinance*, he makes *sport* with it, as he applyes it afterwards, to *young Men*, and *young Women*, *viz.* that they should rather *defer*, & *consider* what they did, and how much *mortification*, and *sanctification*, was *required* therein, then *headily*, and *rashly* to practise it, and which I conceave was *wholesome Counsel*, and no wayes *Ridiculous*, and no other then *John Baptist* gave those that came to his *Baptisme*, *viz.* that they would first bring forth 2. To defer Baptisme is often necessary.

fruits meet for Repentance, and amendment of Life, agreeing also with the advice our *Saviour* gives in the *Case*, *viz.* To sit down, and consider what the Christian life calls for, and what it will cost.

The Ordinance is prophan'd thereby.

Thirdly, From the Sin of *Prophaning an Ordinance*, where he charges *Tertullian* with *contradiction*, *having*, *as he saith*, *else where acknowledged*, *that the Children of Believers were holy*, *whom here he calls Dogs*: Which is Mr. *Wills* mistake, he calls them not *Dogs*, but alludes only to Christs *Proverbial* saying, of *prophaning* an Ordinance, *viz.* that such a *practise* would be as *prophane*, as to cast *Pearls* before Swine, and holy things to *Dogs*.

Irrational & absurd.

Fourthly, From the *absurdity* of Refusing to *intrust Children with temporalls*, *through their want of knowledge*, *and activity*, *and yet commit greater things*; *viz.* *spiritual to them*, *which* he saith, *is a very sorry Argument*, *because Children were capable of Circumcision of Old*, *and of Benediction in the Text*; But what then? were they not meerly *Passive* in both, and wherein neither *knowledge*, *Faith*, or *activity*, was required, but all these *required*, and absolutely necessary in *Baptisme*? *If thou believest with all thy heart*, *thou mayest*; which as Mr. *Baxter* so well observes, *includes* the Negative, *otherwise thou mayst not*.

No Rule for Sureties.

Fifthly, From the *folly* of exposing of *Sureties* (a good witness against them) which, saith Mr. *Wills*, *speaks nothing against Infants Baptisme*: But therein he must *pardon me*, for take away *Sureties* (who were afterwards appointed

to

to Repent, believe, confess, promise, and Renounce, for the Children, as you have heard) Infants Baptisme must needs fall, which had its main foundation upon them.

Sixthly, From the *Consideration*, that the *Adult* Persons were the only Subjects, from the necessity of the *Prerequisites* thereto, *viz. Repentance, Faith, Fasting, Prayer, &c.* To which Master *Wills* saith, *that those might belong to Aliens.* But what is that to *Tertullians* saying? that they, *viz.* the Adult, are *only* to be baptised, from the Reasons, *before mentioned*, so agreeing also with the Scripture. Proper only for the Adult.

Seventhly, From the *insignificancy of the end propounded*, *viz.* To take *away sin*, and was not this *sound Doctrine?* And which, I presume, Mr. *Wills* himself must *conclude*, much more Orthodox, then all the Decrees of the Doctors, and *Councils*, requiring *Children* to be Baptised (upon *penalty* of *damnation*) *to take away their sins.* The end insignificant.

Now therefore what Reason he hath so to *slaunt* over this *witness*, as such a piece of *Dotage*, and contemn it as so *Ridiculous*, is submitted to judgement. Let him but produce as good *Arguments*, from any of his Antient Doctors, for *Infants Baptisme*, we shall not contemn them, and when he makes as good a defence for *Cyprians*, and his 66. Bishops *Grounds* for it, we shall not slight, and scoff at it.

But in further confirmation of this our witness, you have Doctor *Barlow*, telling us, *That Tertullian dislikes, and condemns Infants Baptisme, as unwarrantable, and irrational.* Dr. Barlow.

Daille. *Daille* also tells us, as you have it pag. 149. *That* Tertullian *was of an opinion, that Infants were not to be Baptised.*

Scultet. And *Scultetus* also in his Medul. Pat. Lib. 7. cap. 42. pag. 1. *Tells us, that* Tertullian, *in his Book of Baptisme affirmeth, that they only should be baptised, that were capable of the knowledge of Christ.*

Magdeb. The *Magdeb.* do also tell us, p. 52. *That he was only for Adult Baptisme, and opposed himself to those that affirmed otherwise.*

Beatus Rhenanus. *Beatus Rhenanus*, in his Annotations upon *Tertullian*, saith, *That those that were come to their full growth were Baptised, which custom, saith he, was long observed.*

His own grant. But what need we offer any more, Mr. *Wills himself hath already owned it*, though not so honest, to add him to the other two, he granted me, which the ingenious Reader I doubt not will do.

And as to his *allegation*, that this instance of *Tertullians* denying it, *was a great evidence that it was early practised in the Church, is already spoke to:* For all that can be gathered thence, is that some pleaded for such a *practise*, and that it was as well *confuted*, and *suppressed* (by sound reason, and truth) from this Person of *Note*, but what Man of *Note* witnessed for it, or that the Church, as he saith, in this time *practised* it, is yet to be proved, Mr. *Wills* his insinuation being not sufficient.

Above 40. particular witnesses After *Tertullian* I have given you (from pag. 229, to 237, 243, 246, 285.) above forty more par-

particuler inſtances of Perſons, that have aſſerted Believers, and *denyed Infants Baptiſme*, and to which I did expect (as in *Reaſon*, and *Juſtice* I ought) ſome fair return from my *Antagoniſt*, but inſtead thereof meet with the quite contrary, giving me juſt occaſion of complaint. againſt Infants Baptiſme unanſwered.

Firſt, Becauſe he only excepts againſt ſix, or ſeven, and objects *nothing* againſt all the reſt, and yet allows me but two of the whole Number, viz. *Adrianus*, and *Hincmarus*, ſaying nothing to *Vincentius*, *Victor*, *Heribertus*, *Creſconius*, *Fulgentius*, *Regienſes*, *Albanus*, the *Swermers*, *Arnoldus*, *Henericus*, *Bruno*, and about *thirty* more, ſo fully denying Infants, and aſſerting Believers Baptiſme only: And therefore may it not fairly be concluded, that either his *ſilence* gives *conſent* to the whole, or elſe his dealing is very diſingenious, and unfair. Except only againſt 6. or 7.

Secondly, Becauſe his *Exceptions* againſt thoſe ſix, or ſeven, are ſo frivolous. His exceptions weak & frivolous

Firſt, He tells me, *Berinus* is nothing to my purpoſe, becauſe he reſpects Pagans only; Of which let the Reader judge, who ſaith as p. 232. that Baptiſme ought not to be adminiſtred to any, without inſtruction. Berinus.

Secondly, That *Guillertus*, and *Smaragdus*, were both for Infants *Baptiſme*, which I alſo owne; But with all ſay, that the Dutch Century Writers do tell us, that they both altered their minds, and which I give you at large from them, pag. 234. of which he takes not the leaſt notice. Guill. & Smaragd.

Thirdly, That I brought in *Durandus*, a *ſe-* Durandus.

were Enemy against Anabaptists, in writing against Infants Baptisme, p. 146. the quite contrary he finds, is true in my pag. 242. where I produce him as the great Enemy, and Persecutor of Bruno, and Berengarius, for their witness against Infants Baptisme; and is it not very ingenious, and contradictious for him, to owne that Durandus was so severe an Enemy against Anabaptists, and yet not to acknowledge, and allow me Bruno, and Berengarius, my two witnesses I produce, for denying Infants Baptisme, that he persecuted the same, It is true Durandus is in the Index, I do not know how, put among the witnesses, but the said Index directs to the page, where the Story is rightly told you, and from whence he had the account, what an Enemy he was to the Anabaptists.

Bishop of Aparnen. Fourthly, That the Bishop of Aparnen, &c. was mentioned amongst my witnesses, and pag. 231. said to be for Anabaptisme, yet not said to be against Infants Baptisme, pag. 146. But the late Century Writers, so calling them in a modern sense, we have no Reason to doubt it.

Pet. Bruis. Fifthly, That I have nothing to evidence, that Peter Bruis denyed Infants Baptisme, but the impudent slanders of two lying Abots, when he knows I produced three, or four Evidences more, to prove it: And he also knows, that those pretended absurdities he would bring upon the two Abbots, viz. Clunacenses, and Bernard, are lying forgeries of his own, which I shall presently demonstrate.

Wickliff. Sixthly, That I have no ground to say, that Wickliff

liff denied Infants Baptisme, p. 146. when I produce so much evidence to prove it, which you have from p. 283. to 289. demonstrating, that he not only affirmed, that Believers were the only Subjects of Baptisme, but withal that Children are not Sacramentally to be baptised, and what can be more express evidence in the case.

Another piece of injurious dealing, I have to complain against our Author for, is for his fathering so notorious a falacy upon the Reader, and abuse upon my self, In affirming that I produce a great Bede-role of witnesses against Infants Baptisme, who were so firmly for it, as I in contradiction to my self grant, viz. Austin, Chrysostome, pag. 25. of his. And Theophilact, Anselme, Bede, Gregory, Anslbertus, Albertus, Lumbard, &c. And the three Councels of Bracarens. Tollatan, and Constantinople in his Recapitulation, p. 139, &c.

A notorious falacy, & abuse detected.

Whereas I have again, and again said, that I produce them not as positive witnesses against Infants Baptisme, there being not one of them in my Catalogue (which would have been madness indeed, when I have brought them in amongst those that have asserted Infants Baptisme) but for these Reasons only, viz.

1. First, to shew what strong Arguments, so agreeing to the Scripture Institution, and pattern, they have themselves produced for Believers Baptisme only, viz. From the necessity of Confession, and Profession of Faith, and Repentance, before Baptisme

Why Persons owning Infants Baptisme are produced for witnesses.

2. Secondly, upon what weak, and erroneous Grounds, they assert Infants Baptisme also, most of

of which I have given pro, and con, that their contradictions, not mine, may appear.

3. Thirdly, that, that, which they make to *Reconcile* that contradiction, may appear insignificant, *viz.* the Confession, and Profession of *Gossips*, or *Sureties* for them, of which the Scripture makes no mention, and whereby all the former Authorities, for Believers Baptisme, may appear good for us, and against themselves.

The witnesses produced from Churches.

Having thus cleared my Testimonies, given in from particuler *Persons*, I come in the next place, to examine what he hath *said* to the witnesses, produced from the several Churches. I have mentioned, *viz.* the *Waldenses*, *Donatists*, *Britains*, *&c.* concerning whom he is pleased thus to express himself, p. 129. *And in reference to the confidence of my Antagonist, that the Waldenses, Donatists, and Britains, were all against Infants Baptisme, when none of them were, makes good the Proverb, Pertweant Montes, &c.*

But what cause he *hath for this confident vain glorious boast, will soon be tryed.*

The Witness born by the Waldenses, *against Infants Baptisme, justified.*

The 4 fold Evidence to prove the Waldenses denyed Infants Baptisme.

THe first he *opposeth*, is that of the *Waldenses*, whose witness, against Infants Baptisme, I make good from a four fold *Demonstration*, *viz.* First, From their Confessions of *Faith*. Secondly, From the witness born thereto, by their most *eminent Men*. Thirdly, From the *Decrees of Councels, Popes, and Emperors*, against the *Body*

of

of the People, for the same. And Fourthly, From the *Footsteps* thereof, they have left in the several *Regions, and Contreys*, where they have been *dispersed*.

Upon which he makes this following reply, pag. 46. *viz. That there are two sortes of People, that 'tis like will be imposed upon by the Flourishes, which this Champion makes, those who are ignorant, and those who are prejudiced against Infants Baptisme, no doubt but all this will passe for Gospel amongst such:* But I may say of the Author, *Multa loquitur, sed nihil dicit*, or rather *probat*; and that *which he saith, is but Vox, & praterea nihil: A great sound of words, but no proof*; and this he *promiseth to make appear in order.*

To the First, as to the Confessions of Faith, he saith two things: First, *that there are no such Confessions to be found of that Nature, nor any thing that looks like a Confession, unless it be in Utopia*, pag. 111. *But my Adversary hath a notable dexterity, to prove, Quidlibet, ex quolibet*, p. 46.

Secondly, *That the quite contrary appears by their contrary Confessions of Faith, witnessing how firmly they did assert Infants Baptisme*, pag. 46, and 64. &c.

To both which I answer, *First*, that it may be manifest to the *Reader*, that their *Confessions of Faith*, do indeed *exclude* Infants from *Baptisme*, I shall give in a Parallel betwixt, what their *Confessions* say, and what he, in the *Repetition* thereof, makes them say, and leave it to judgement, how fairly he hath dealt therein.

What

What their Confessions are, p. 239, &c.

The Waldenses Confessions of Faith.

[That God hath not only instructed us by his Word.] But hath also ordained certain Sacraments to be joined with it, as a means to unite us unto, and so make us partakers of his benefits.

And that there are only two of them [belonging in Common to all Members of the Church, under the New Testament, viz. Baptisme, and the Lords Supper.]

We do believe, that in the Sacrament of Baptisme, water is the visible, and External sign, which represents unto us.

That which [by the invisible vertue of God operating] is within [us] viz. the Renovation of the Spirit, and the Mortification of our Members in Jesus Christ.

By which also we are received into the holy Congre-

What he makes their Confessions to be, p. 45, &c.

God hath ordained certain Sacraments to be joined with the word, as a means to unite us unto, and to make us partakers of his benefits.

And that there are only two of them.

We do believe that in the Sacrament of Baptisme, water is the visible, and external sign, which represents unto us

That which

is within viz. Renovation of the Spirit, and Mortification of our Members in Jesus Christ.

gation

gation of the People of God, their professing, and declaring openly our faith, and amendement of life.]

We esteem for an abomination, and Anti-Christian, all humane inventions, as a trouble, and prejudice to the Liberty of the Spirit.

When humane Traditions, are observed for Gods Ordinances, then is he worshiped in vain, as Es. 19. Matth. 15. And which is done when grace is attributed to the External Ceremonies, and persons enjoined, to partake of Sacraments, without faith and truth.

That Anti-Christ, attributes the Regeneration of the holy Spirit, unto the dead outward work of baptizing Children [into that Faith] and teacheth that thereby, [Baptisme] and Regeneration must be had, [grounding therein all in Christianity, which is against the holy Spirit.]

We esteem for an abomination, and Anti-Christian, all humane inventions, as a trouble, and prejudice to the Liberty of the Spirit.

When humane Traditions, are observed for Gods ordinances, then is he worshiped in vain, as Es. 19. Mat. 15. And which is done, when grace is attributed to the External Ceremonies, and persons enjoined, to partake of Sacraments, without faith, and truth.

That Anti-Christ attributes the Regeneration of the holy Spirit, unto the dead outward work of baptizing Children, ——— and teacheth that thereby, ——— Regeneration must be had:

Where-

Whereby you have demonstrated, his great unfaithfulness in misrepresenting their Confessions, by leaving out so many material, and considerable parts thereof, that make against him, and then so unfairly, and untruly to say: *That there was a Harmony betwixt all the Protestants Churches in the World, in those Articles, and the* Waldenses, *because all that are for Infants Baptisme, believe the same.*

But whether it be so indeed, let us examine the particulers.

1. Infants not capable to hear the Word.

First, Do all the Pædobaptists believe, *That Baptisme, and preaching the Word, are joined together, to instruct the Baptised parties, and that thereby they have union with Christ, and partake of his benefits?* Pray, how is that to be made good, in any Infant, that has no actual knowledge, Faith or understanding?

2. Nor of the Lords Supper.

Secondly, Do they indeed *believe the Lords Supper, to belong in Common, with Baptisme, to all the Members of the Church*, why then do not Infants partake of one, as well as the other, since it belonges to them in Common, if Members of the Church, as Mr. *Wills* saith, they are?

3. Nor to understand the Symbole thereof.

Thirdly, Do Pædobaptists, with the *Waldenses*, believe as you say, That *water in Baptisme is the usual sign, representing to the Subject thereof, the invisible vertue of God operating in them*, viz. *Renovation of the Spirit, and Mortification of their Members?* And can it be truly said, it is so to an Infant, that is not capable to put forth any act of Faith, Repentance, or Mortification, or discern any the least sign in the wa-

ter

ter, of any such things signified thereby.

Fourthly, Have they indeed a *Harmony* with the *Waldenses*, in what further they confess, concerning this *Ordinance*? *Viz. That by it they are received into the holy Congregation of the People of God, there professing, and declaring openly their Faith, and amendment of life.* But how is the Infant capable, with the *Waldensian* Christians (not *Pagan* converts) *to professe, and declare openly their Faith, and Repentance, and so to be received into the Congregation thereby?* 4. Not to make Confession of Faith before it.

Fifthly, Do Pædobaptists indeed believe with them, *That humane Traditions, and Inventions, are to be esteemed Anti-Christian abominations, and vain worship,* and that that worship is vain, and Traditional, when Persons are enjoined to it, without Faith, and truth? Why then are Infants baptised by them, that have no *Faith*, or *knowledge of truth?* and for which there is neither *Precept*, or *Example* in Gods word? and by themselves owned to be an *unwritten Tradition?* 5. That Infants Baptisme is a humane Tradition, and why.

Sixthly, Do they believe, *That Anti-Christ Grounds all Christianity, and Religion, in the Baptisme of Children, attributing Regeneration to that outward work done, contrary to the holy Spirit?* Why then do they *baptise Children*, which as *acknowledged*, is the basis, and *Foundation* of the false Church, and so contrary to the *Spirit*, and for which there is nothing, but the Decrees of *Popes*, and *Anti Christian* Councels, to warrant it. 6. Anti-Christ groundsall Religion in it.

Whereby you see, that Infants are manifestly excluded Baptisme, in these six particulers, in these *Confessions*, and that Pædobaptists can-

not assert the same, without evident contradiction to *themselves*.

Objection 2. to the contrary Confessions.

But in the next place, if these Confessions be good as you say, against Infants Baptisme, yet what do you say to those contrary Confessions, that own the Baptizing of Infants, as Master *Wills* hath given them from *Perin*. p. 62. 63. 65.

Answer.

To which I say, it is to me matter of the greatest *admiration*, that I having with that *exactness*, especially in the last *Edition*, given you such a particuler *Account* of all those *Confessions*, word for word, both of that of *Bohemia*, and that of *Provence*; and proved to you by such ample *Demonstration*, the following *particulers*; *viz.* First, That none of them were extant *till* the sixteenth Century, whereas the other are upon Record in the eleventh, or twelfeth Centuries, so many hundred years before. Secondly, That that *Confession*, said to be made by the *Waldenses* in *Bohemia*, to King *Ladislaus*, were not *Waldenses*, as they themselves *acknowledge* in the *preamble* thereof. Thirdly, Have given an account, *how*, and *by what means*, and *when*, those of *Provence* came to introduce that *Custom*, so contrary to what their ancient *Barbes had instructed* them in; How sadly they had *declined* even to going to *Mass*; And how *contradictions* that practice was, *to other parts of the Confessions*, into which it was *foisted*; And that these *Waldenses* of *Provence*, that made these *Confessions*, were inconsiderable to the Body of that People, that was dispersed into so many parts of the World, that held the contrary. Yet Mr. *Wills* should take so little notice

notice, of what I have said; and Mr. *Blindman* that has written since (who has also *transcribed* the said *contrary Confessions*) without the least notice to what I *have said*, in answer thereto; which I think is such an abuse, as was never offred by any, pretending to answer *Books*, and therefore I must refer them, and all others that desire satisfaction therein, to what I have so fully, and as I humbly conceave, *unanswerably* spoken to each *Confession*.

The Second Demonstration, proving that the *Waldenses* denyed Infants Baptisme, is from the *witnesses*, that was born against it, by some of their most eminent leading Men; *viz. Berengarius* in the eleventh Century; *Peter Bruis*, *Henericus*, and *Arnoldus*, in the twelfth.

2. From their eminent leading Men, who denyed Infants Baptisme.

First, *Berengarius*, who was so famous, *that the Waldenses were called after his name for a hundred years after*, *as Mr. Clark tells us*, and who filled all *France*, *Italy*, *and England*, with his *Doctrine*, *as Matthew Paris*, and who so eminently witnessed, not only against *Transubstantion*, but Infants *Baptisme*, which is *made good*.

1. Berengarius.

First, From the reply that *Lanifrank*, Archbishop of *Canterbury*, gave to him upon that point, in his Book called *Scintillarie*, saying, *that in denying Infants Baptisme, he did oppose the General Doctrine, and general consent of the Church*, Magd. Cent. 11. c. 5. p. 240.

Proved 1. by Lanifrank.

Secondly, *Cassander* out of *Guitmond*, *That with the real presence, he denyed Baptisme to little ones, though the latter not so publickly as the former.*

2. Cassander.

3. Councel in France. Thirdly, By the Councel, called by Henry the I. of France, to suppress the *Heresies of Bruis, and Berengarius, for denying Transubstantiation, and Infants Baptisme. Bib. Pat. p. 432.*

4. Thuanus. Fourthly, from the testimony of *Thuanus*, witnessing, *that* Bruno, *Archbishop of Triers, did persecute the* Beringarians, *for denying Infants Baptisme, as you have it, p. 242, 243.*

The witnesses to prove it not excepted against. None of which he excepts against, only saith, *that there were several Councels, in which* Berengarius *was persecuted for the Real presence, but no mention is made of his denying Infants Baptisme*, pag. 51.

But what then? this four fold testimony is enough to prove it.

2. P. Bruis, Henry, & Arnold. Secondly, *Peter Bruis*, *Henericus*, and *Arnoldus*, all in the twelfeth Century, and so eminent that the *Waldenses* for a long time were called by their names, *viz. Petrobrusiani*, *Henrici*, and *Arnoldi*, did all of them deny *Infants* Baptisme, which is made good by these following Testimonies, *viz.*

Testified by. First, That *Peter Bruis* denyed it, is testified

1. Cluniacenses charge against them. by *Peter Cluniacenses*, who amongst *the several things he charges him with* (fifteen in number) *puts his denying Infants Baptisme in the front, in four particulars*, Osiander Century 12. Lib. 3. cap. 3.

2. In his Letter to 3. Bishops. Secondly, The said *Peter Cluniacenses*, writes to three Bishops in France, *that the Petrobrusiani, and Henrici, denyed Infants Baptisme, and held Rebaptization, &c. and that when he urged for Pedobaptisme, the Authority of* Austin, *and the Latin*

Fa-

Fathers; Peter, and his Colegues, *appealed to the Scripture, and the Greek Church.*

Thirdly, *Cassander* testifies, in his Epistle to the Duke of Cleve, *that* Peter Bruis, *and* Henericus, *denyed Baptisme to little ones, affirming that only the Adult should be baptised.* 3. Cassander.

Fourthly, Doctor *Reginaldus* saith *in his Latin Councels*, that Peter Bruis, *and* Arnoldus of Brixia, *were, in the second Lateran Council censured, for the Heresie of Rejecting Infants Baptisme, Church buildings, and adoration of the Cross.* 4. By the Latin Councel.

Fifthly, *Bernard*, Abbot of *Clarevalle* in Burgundy, *doth in his Letter to the Earl of St.* Giles, *in his 204. Epistle, accuse the* Henerici, *or Apostolici, of the Heresie of denying Infants Baptisme.* 5. Bernard

And in his 65. Serm. on the Cant. *charges them to oppose Infants Baptisme, Transubstantiation, Purgatory, praying for the Dead, &c.* Oliand. Cent. 12. L. 3. c. 6. p. 791.

All which *Bernard* said, he had either *by investigation* (*or diligent search*) *personal disputation with them, or from those that were come from them.* Magd. Century 12. cap. 5. pag. 844 (the latter whereof Mr. *Wills* only takes notice of, so partial is he in his remarks.)

Sixthly, *Vicecomes* L. 2. ch. 1. *That the* Henerici, *and Apostoloci, denyed Infants Baptisme.* 6. Vicecomes.

Seventhly, Doctor *Hamond* confesseth, *that* Peter Bruis, *and* Henry *his Scholar, and the* Petro Brusiani, *and* Henricani, *that sprang from them, oppose Infants Baptisme*, Tombes 3. Review, pag. 827. 7. Dr. Hamond.

To all which Testimony Mr. *Wills* gives in this

ception, pag. 53. &c. *That most of this witness is gathered from lying Papists, especially two lying Abbots*, Bernard, *and* Cluniacenses; *And tells me in as much as I have cited* Osiander, *he doubts it may be some prejudice to my cause; because what ever* Osiander *saith of* Peter Bruis, *and* Henericus, *denying Infants Baptisme, he taketh it out of the works of* Petez Cluniacenses, *who doth Calumniari fortiter, lay very abominable errors to their charge, and amongst others, this vanish one, of denying Infants Baptisme. Now if any credit must be given to this Abbot, it must be per totum, through out in all, & else in nothing: And verily if his testimony be valide, and the Author from him, our opposites need not glory in such* Waldenses, *that they comported with their opinions, nor we trouble at their dissenting from us.*

Let us now therefore, saith he pag. 53. *look into the wicked, and false testimony, or account, this lying Abbot gives of those two precious Ministers* Peter Bruis, *and* Henricus, *as Osiander takes it out of* **his own writings** (viz. Cluniacenses.) *viz.*

First, *Baptismum abjiciunt*: *They cast of Baptisme, meaning that of Infants.*

Secondly, *Corporum resurrectionem negant*: *They deny the Resurrection.*

Thirdly, *Carnem comedi prohibent*: *They forbid eating flesh.*

Fourthly, *Christum non esse Deum, &c.* That *Christ is not God, nor took flesh on the Virgin, &c.*

Fifthly, *Ecclesiam non posse aliquid possidere nisi*

in-

in communi, &c. That the Church should possess all things in common.

Then saith by this time, I suppose we may conclude that those Waldenses *were vile persons, or* Cluniacenses *a lying Abbot.*

And then goes on, p. 57. with great severity to chastise me: Now me thinks he should blush at his indiscretion, for introducing such a Popish calumniation, for an evidence in this matter: And if he believe that Abbot slandered Peter Bruis, *and his followers, in these things, I hope he will excuse the Reader, if he believe he did no lesse, when he chargeth them to be against Infants Baptisme.*

I yet by this, that when Men are ingaged in a cause, and wedded to an opinion, they will not refuse the most sordid, and shamefull wayes to promote it: They will fall in with slanderous Papists, and take up what they say, to defend their opinions, witnesse my Antagonist, and his Predecessor Mr. Tombes, *who was heretofore checkt for this very thing, and who boldly justifies himself, and tells us in his Preface, pag. 29. that* Cluniacenses, *though a zealous Papist, yet thought fit by* Illyricus, *to be reckoned amongst witnesses of truth in his Catalogue; and that if such as he, and* Bernard, *be not taken for witnesses of things in their time, I know not how the Protestants will make up, their Catalogue of witnesses in all Ages; which, he saith, are dangerous words.*

To which I answer, first, let it be taken notice, that as to the proof offred by me, for these my witnesses, amongst the several instances produced, he falls upon that which he thinks the most

Answer. his part is dealing.

weak, the usual method he takes with me all along, and avoids that which he finds most strength in, which favours of a very partial mind; and truly, I conceave, were *Clunicaenses* testimony from *Osiander* left out, there is enough from all the rest, to prove that *Peter Bruis*, *Henricus*, and *Arnoldus*, denyed Infants Baptisme; the latter of which this eminent *Arnoldus* he takes no notice of.

2. His Falshood. But in the next place, since he layes so much stress upon this supposed mistaken part of the testimony, to cast reproach upon all the rest, we will join issue with him, in the Examination thereof, and the rather because he intitles Mr. *Baxter*, and Mr. *Marshal*, also to the exception too. Know therefore, that hence, you have a further discovery of the great unfaithfulness, and want of Conscience in the Author, for daring thus to abuse the World with a cheat, and that which he knows to be a meer forgery of his own, and which will I doubt, not appear to you by the following Circumstances.

1. None of Clunia-censes. First, He knows that *Clunicaenses*, that he calls the lying Abbot, hath given no such wicked, and false testimony, as he produceth from him out of *Osiander*, for both *Osiander*, and the *Magdeburgs*, from whom he *had* it, gives an account of fifteen particulers, where with he charges *Peter Bruis*, as receiving them either from his own *mouth*, or *as Mr. Wills acknowledgeth, from their own writings, and not upon uncertain Reports*, p. 56. And which are these that follows, *viz. the four first, against Infants Baptisme*;

the

the three next, *against Transubstantiation*, the eighth, *against praying for the dead*, the nineth, *for Priests Marriage*, the tenth, *against Adoration of Crosses*, the eleventh, *against superstitious adoring of Temples*, the twelfeth, *against Church musick*, the thirteenth, *for the lawfulness to eat fish on Sundays, and Fast dayes*, the fourteenth, *that upon common fame, as he saith, they did not receive the whole Canon of the Scripture* (which saith Osiander) *was as he supposeth the Apocriphal writings*, and which appears *by the next*, the fifteenth, *that they only received the Canon of Scripture* (*solis Canonicis credunt*) *and that the sayings of the Ancients were not to be compared to it*. The 12. first *of these Cluniacenses*, particularly, and at large in several pages, makes answer too Magdeb. Cent. 12. p. 832, &c. *Osiander* Cent. 12. L. 3. c. 3. But here is not a word, *of denying the Resurrection, Christs Incarnation*, or such abominations, said to be delivered by *Cluniacenses*, and by him charged upon them.

Secondly, that *Osiander*, that he so often saith, reports it, and that therefore I did my self injury; he doubted in mentioning him, hath not one word of any such thing as from *Cluniacenses*, but only makes the repetition of those fifteen particulers, out of the *Magdeburgs* word for word, as *Osiander* Century 12. L. 3. cap. 3. is manifest.

2. Osiander reports no such thing from Cluniacenses.

Thirdly, He knows that these particulers he mentions, were not charged upon *Peter Bruis*, but upon the *Albegeois* in the following *Century*, by other hands then *Bernard*, and *Cluniacenses*, who

3. Not charged upon Pet. Bruis, but upon others by

other hand who were *dead long before*; for *Helvicus* tells us, that Bernard (who was cotemporary with *Cluniacenſis*, *Peter Bruis*, and *Henricus*) flouriſhed about 1110. And *Oſiander* tells us, that this *Albigenſian* Sect, or Hereſie, was charged with theſe things by the Monks Inquiſitors, *Sabellicus*, *Sebaſtianus* Anno 1206. who by Pope *Innocent* the *third*, that Devil Incarnat, what were ſent to diſcover that People, againſt whom he came forth with many of others ſo much murderous cruelty, by *fire*, and *ſword*, with an *Army* of hundred thouſand *Men*, to root up, and deſtroy them: And therefore the better to juſtify his cruelties, and to provoke all *Europe*, to come in to help theſe wicked Imps *of his*, thus *paint* out theſe poor People, as the Monſters of Man-kind.

is another Age.

Why Mr. Wills did this knowingly.

And that Mr. *Wills* hath done this *knowingly*, appears, firſt, by his *picking* out only the *five particulars*, out of *twenty*, leaving out the moſt *groſs*, *viz.* their owning *two Gods*, *viz.* God, and the Devil; their *condemning of Marriage*; and *juſtifying all manner* of *Luxury*, *and uncleanneſs*; and patronizing *Theſts*, and *Roberies*, *&c.*

1.

2. Secondly, that he knows *Oſiander* ſaith theſe things, are not reported by *Cluniacenſes*, and *Bernard*, but by *Lucelburgius*, *Antonius*, *Vincentius* *&c.*

3. Thirdly, Becauſe he neither mentions Century, Book, Chapter, or Page, which in other Quotations, out of *Oſiander*, he uſeth to do.

Therefore let it be judged, whether he hath not injuriouſly belyed *Oſiander*, belyed *Cluniacenſes*, belyed *Peter Bruis*, belyed the *truth*, which

which by this forgery he would cover, and hide; abused the World, belyed, and abused me also in especial, whom he deals so severly with for the same, as you have heard; But much more fear his own Conscience, by this piece of folly, and Falshood.

And therefore may we not well return his own words (which he gives me hereupon: *viz. Now we thinke the Author should blush at his indiscretion, for introducing such evidence. and I see by this, that when Men are ingaged in a cause, and wedded to an opinion, they will not refuse the most fordid, and shameful wayes to promote it.*

Thirdly, That the *Waldenses* did deny Infants Baptisme, appears from the Decrees of several Emperors, and Popes, against the Body of the People for the same: And the writings of learned Men, living in those times, which you have at large, from p. 248, to 255. *viz.* 3. From the Decrees made against them for denying Infants Baptisme.

First, *The Decrees of* Robert, *King of France*, Anno 1000. *first against the* Waldenses *of Thoulouse, afterwards against several at Orleans, for denying Infants Baptisme.*

Secondly, *The Decrees of the Emperor* Henry *the* second, Anno 1017. *to punish this Sect.*

Thirdly, *The Decrees of the Emperor* Henry *the* fourth, Anno 1054. *for their denying Infants Baptisme. &c.*

Fourthly, *The Decrees of Pope* Leo *the* nineth, Anno 1050. *to establish Infants Baptisme, denyed by them.*

Fifthly, *The Decrees of Pope* Gregory *the* seventh, Anno 1070. *for the same.*

Sixth-

Sixthly, *The Decrees of* Pope Alexander *the* third, *against the* Waldenses, *for denying Infants Baptisme, and the several wayes he took to prosecute, and persecute them, for the same.*

Seventhly, *The Decrees in the* Gallican *Councel, against them for the same.*

Eightly, *The Decrees of the general* Lateran *Councel, against them for the same.*

Ninenthly, *The Decrees of Pope* Lucius, Anno 1181. *in the Councel of* Veroni, *against them for the same.*

Tenthly, *The Decrees of the Pope* Urbane, *against them for the same.*

Eleventhly, *The Decrees of Pope* Cælestine, *against them for the same.*

Twelfethly, *The Decrees, and bloody actings, of Pope* Innocent *the* third, *against them for the same.*

The writings also of several learned Men, of these times, that opposed the *Waldenses* in this point: and charged the whole party therewith, *viz. Eckbertus, Erbrardus, Ermigendus, Cluniacenses, Bernard, Durandus, Thomas Walden;* And to whom we add some others of great eminency, that have come to hand, *viz.*

Erminger-dus. *Ermingerdus,* who wrote his Book contra *Waldenses* in this Age, wherein he chargeth them in these words: *Dicunt etiam quod nulli nisi proprio ore, & corde hoc Sacramentum petat potest prodesse; Inde adducentes hunc errorem, quod parvulis Baptismus aquæ nihil prosit: They say, that the Sacrament of Baptisme can profit none, but those who with their own proper mouths, and hearts, desire the same; from whence they draw the error, that water*

or Baptisme is not profitable to little Children, Vet. Bib. Pat. Tom. 5. p. 1250.

And *Rainerius* in his Book contra *Waldenses*, Rainerius. saith: *De Baptismo dicunt, quod ablutio quæ datur Infantibus nihil prosit, item quod patrini non intelligunt, quid respondeant Sacerdoti: Concerning Baptisme, they say, that that which is given to little Children profits nothing, and that the Gossips understand not their Responses to the Priests*, Bib. Patr. Tom. 13. pag. 300, 301, &c. And which evidence I desire the Reader to take the more notice of, because Mr. *Wills* doth so positively deny that *Rainerius*, in the Catalogue of their errors gives not the least hint of any such thing, no not one word of their denying Infants Baptisme; which, he saith, is very strange, if he had understood any thing thereof, *Wills* p. 96, 97, 98.

You have also *Favin*, *the French Chronologer*, Favin. *affirming that in these times*, viz. *twelfth*, *and thirteenth Century*, *the Albigenses did deny Infants Baptisme*, *esteeming it superstitious*.

Against all which he gives no particuler exception, only saith these two things; First, *that whereas I cite two Canons of Pope* Alexander *the third*, *that was but just about the rise of the* Waldenses, *who were so called*, *from* Peter Waldo *of Lyons*, *about* 1160. (*as* Perin *informeth*.) And which is evidence, as he supposeth, against the former Decrees, inferring that those mentioned, to be made before that time, were before they were a People.

And Secondly, in pag. 60. saith: *That there is a convincing proof to be fetcht from hence, of their being*

being against Infants Baptisme, because they were their Enemies, calumniating malicious Papists, that loaded them with all manner of reproaches, to render them odious: And that unless some one doth, out of their one mouths give better evidence, he shall believe, with Mr. Marshal, *that this Doctrine of opposing the baptizing of Infants of Believers, is an Innovation, no ancienter then the Anabaptists in Germany; and for which he quotes,* Joseph Vicecomes L. 2. c. 1. pag. 103. in Mr. *Wills* pag. 60. 2. part.

1. Waldense so called from the Vallyes from Ancient time

To both which I say, First, to the first Exception, *you will find that* Beza *tells us, that they mistake themselves, that say, they were called* Waldenses *from* Peter Waldo, *in as much as they were so called from the place of their abode in the Valleyes, as at large you have it in mine,* pag. 338, & 342. *And that* Claudius Seiscelius, *Counceler to* Charles *the* Great, *in the eight Century, mentions them by that name, in his Book contra* Waldenses. But however the People, or Sect of the *Waldenses*, were known, or distinguished by several names, as the *People of Lyons &c.* as *Eusebius tells us*, p. 340. And set forth in story under *divers names*, in several *Ages*, as Doctor *Usher* tells us, and which you have more particulerly, p. 338, &c.

Mr. Marshals grant

And to the second, that there is convincing proof, offred from the Decrees of Popes, Kings, and Councels, let Mr. *Marshals* grant suffice, who in pag. 83. of his Defence for Infants Baptisme, saith thus: *I shall desire you, to shew that any Company, or Sect (if you will so call them) have denied Infants Baptisme, produce if you can,*

any

any of their Confessions, alledge any Acts of any Councells, where this Doctrine was charged upon any, and condemned in that Councel?

And which I presume is substantially *done*; both from their *Confessions of Faith*; and from Acts of Councels also, where such were condemned.

And as to that Quotation out of *Vicecomes*, to prove that none denyed Infants Baptisme, till the German *Anabaptists*, I heartily thank him for it; which you'l find doth the contrary, giving an Account of several, that denyed Infants Baptisme before that time, as you have it in the Quotation he refers to, p. 102, 103. telling us in these words.

That as the Adult Baptisme, no one ever doubted thereof, witness (as he saith) *the Monuments, & Writings of all the holy Fathers, and Occumenical Councels, as well as the Scriptures themselves, especially the Acts of the Apostles.*

Vicecom. owns that many had denyed Infants Baptisme of old.

But as for Infants Baptisme, he tells us, that Vincentius, Victor, Hincmarus of Laudum, the Semerici, and Apostolici, (in Bernard, and Cluniacenses time.) John Wickliff in his 4. Book of Trialog. c. 2. Walafrid, Strabo, Ludovicus Vives, &c. do all of them witness against it, in their times. So that we have a good confirming evidence, from his Authority, to establish the truth, we have asserted, and he denyed.

It is true, *Viecomes* in the same place, adds amongst the rest of the witnesses against Infants Baptisme, *Luther, Calvin*, and *Beza*; and the reason is, because they did oppose, and neglect to

do it, as the Church of *Rome* ordained, and practised it, setting it up in a New way, without the Services, and Ceremonies of the Church, and which was all one to them, as if it was not practised at all; and therefore did the Church of *Rome* renounce of old, as you have heard; the Baptisme of the Greek Church, as the Greeks renounced theirs, rebaptised those that were baptised by either, as much as if it had not been at all, by either side.

4. From the Foot-steps they had left thereof, in several Countrys.

And Fourthly, That the *Waldenses* did deny Infants Baptisme, appears from the Footsteps we find hereof, in those respective *Regions*, and *places*, where they had heretofore *imprinted* it, as appears by the following *instances*. It being acknowledged that they were dispersed all *Europe* over, *viz.*

In Germany.

First, In *Germany*, through all the parts thereof, where they planted *Churches*, and has *Schools* in so much, that their *Barbes* could travel all the Countrey *over*, and lye every night at a *Friends house*, wherein, both by *Doctrine* and suffering, *this* truth was eminently *confirmed*, and for which you have several *instances*, from most parts of the Country, from p. 256, to 260.

Switzerland.

Secondly, *In* Switzerland, *where in like manner it was witnessed to*, from 260, to 267.

Flandres.

Thirdly, *In* Flanders, *where it was also confirmed, and seal'd with much blood*, pag. 267, to 269.

Holland.

Fourthly, *In* Holland, *or low Countryes, where it was also witnessed to, with much blood, and Martyrdom*, p. 265, to 271.

Fifthly,

Fifthly, *In* Bohemia, *where it was eminently confirmed alſo*, p. 271, to 273. Bohemia.

Sixthly, *In* Hungaria, *in like manner*, p. 273, to 274. Hungaria.

Seventhly, *In* Tranſylvania *evidenced alſo*, *as* p. 274. Tranſylv.

Eightly, *In* Poland *a confirmation thereof*, pag. 274. Poland.

In *England* it hath alſo beon *confirmed*, through many Ages, by Chriſtians under ſeveral *denominations*, *viz.* By *Waldenſes*, *Lollards*, *Wickliffians*, and *Anabaptiſts*, through all the Kings *Reigns*, from the Conqueſt to this very day, as at large you have it from p. 275, to 310.

To all which he ſaith thus, much by way of Conceſſion; viz. *that the* Waldenſes *were indeed ſpread, not only by [illegible], but by their own voluntary choice before, into all theſe Regions, is not to be doubted.*

But that the Oppoſers of Infants Baptiſme, in the Upper, and Lower Germany, were the remains, and offſpring of thoſe the Waldenſes, *is a conceit forreign to all Hiſtory, and hath no Foundation in reaſon, or truth; and that his ipſe dixit, or ſaying ſo, is no ground for us to believe it, he affirming it only from conjeſture, and that ariſeth alſo from his will, according to that ſaying: Quod volumus, facile credimus: What we would have, we eaſily believe.*

To which I ſay, that if I have proved that this was their *Doctrine*, and practiſe, by their *Confeſſions* of Faith, the *practiſe* of their *ancient*, and *honourable Barbes*, and *Worthyes*, by the Decrees Anſwer.

crees of *Popes*, *Emperors*, and *Councels*; by the *prints* they have left thereof in the several Countryes ('tis confessed they were driven into) and all this by ancient *Records* and authentick *Testimony*, which I presume I have (as yet) undenyably done.

Then I rest confident; that the *judicious* Reader will acquit me of this *slander*, of an *ipse dixit*, and that it is only my will, and *pleasure*, to say all *this* of my own head, and Fancy without *proof*. The *German Baptists* do in their *Martyrologe*, prove their *dissent* from the *Waldenses*: through out the *Centuries*. *Perin* tells us, that *Lollard* was a *Waldensian Barbe*, and that *Jo Wickliff* asserted no other but the Doctrine of the *Waldenses*, being instructed th[illegible] by the *Lollards*.

This further Testimony have met with, in the *Dutch* Book of Martyrs, which I desire the Reader to take notice of, as full measure, and heaped up, as Mr. *Wills* words it.

Cæsarius. First, They tell us, from *Jacob Merningus* p. 733. Cent. 13. ch. 5. out of *Cæsarius*, That the *Waldenses*, *and Albigenses*, *have rejected Infants Baptisme*, *saying that it is of no force*, *nor profitable to any*, *before they are taught*, *and do believe*, *but concerning that Baptisme*, *according to Christs appointment*, *they have a very high valew*, *and esteem*. Dutch Martyr, pag. 307.

Dubravius &c. Secondly, That the *Waldenses* were called *Anabaptists*, *long before* John Hus, *they quote the testimony of several*, viz. *Dubravius*, *Miechovius*, *Cromerus*. *Mr. Glanesus* from *Merningus* p. 733.

Raineriut. Thirdly, That the said *Merningus* pag. 618, 619,

619, 629. *makes it good from* Rainerius, *the Monk Inquisitor, that wrote his Book contra Waldenses* in the 12. Century, *That the* Waldenses *did deny Infants Baptisme, and produceth divers of* Rainerius *his Arguments, against them for the same, and which he quotes from the* Bib. Patrum Tom. 13. p. 300. Though Mr. *Wills* is pleased to tell us p. 97. *that* Rainerius *saith never a word, about their denying Infants Baptisme.*

Fourthly, they tell us, that *Balthazar Lydius*, in his *Treat. of the Church, and of the Waldenses*, p. 86. Col. 1. tells us, *that they reprove many things in the Popish Sacraments, and say, that the baptizing of Children is not profitable to them*, Dutch Martyr p. 309. Balthazar Lydius.

Fifthly, *Treat* Abraham Mellinus *in his History of Martyrs*, p. 447. Col. 1. *doth tell us, That the* Waldenses *so cast far from them all the Sacraments of the Romish Church, and amongst them, do wholy reject that of Infants Baptisme, as unprofitable, and unnecessary*, Dutch Martyr. p. 320. Ab. Mellinus.

And therefore the whole of this Story, concerning this ancient honourable People, the *Waldenses* is submitted to judgement, and whether I have not good cause to conclude it, with the return (of Mr. *Wills* his own words upon himself) which he speaks to me upon this very occasion, p. 44. *viz.*

And is it not a miserable Cause indeed, whose Advocates must still have recourse to lyes for its defence, and an Argument of the want of honesty, and conscience for Men to persist in this Course, when more then enough hath been said, to convince Mr. Wills his words returned upon himself.

them of the evil thereof; *It was a solemn Rebuk, which* Job *gave his mistaken Friends, &c. Will you lye (saith he) for God? Surely he hath no need of, nor doth he require us by any sinister, and sinful way, to justify him in his attributes, providences, cause, or truth, As touching the matter in hand before us, if the Pædobaptists have the truth on their side, yet certainly it is little beholding to some of them, who have attempted to defend it by so many unwarrentable wayes; In particuler I have made it appear, that the present Author, with whom I have to deal with, is fowly criminal, in laying out the utmost of his skill, in traducing those famous ancient Christians, as if in their several Generations (heretofore) they had not witnessed for Believers, against Infants Baptisme, when he cannot but knew they were not only falsly, and maliciously charged (but cruelly, and murderously handled) by their Anti-Christian Enemyes, for their faithful witness to these disputed truths, &c.*

The witness born by the Donatists, *against Infants Baptisme, confirmed.*

Donatists. THe next witness he opposeth, is that of the *Donatists*, concerning whom I gave divers *Authorities*, proving that they did *deny Infants Baptisme.*

To which Mr. *Wills* is pleased to say, *that it is only my ipse dixit, and that I do thereby render my self guilty of a great mistake, to say, that of them whereas neither the Magdeburgs, nor Daneus in his Opuscul-lum, nor several other Writers, do charge any such thing upon them.*

To

To which I ſay, that herein Mr. *Wills* deals, according to his wonted manner, very *diſingenuouſly* with me. Firſt, That having given ſo many *Authorities*, and of ſuch *Antiquity* to prove it, to tell the Reader it is my *Ipſe dixit* only. Secondly, To deny them, and yet give no juſt *exception* againſt them. Thirdly, To produce the negative (or ſilence rather) of ſome modern Authors, to oppoſe ſo many *poſitive Authorities*, produced by me, one of which, in all pleas, is worth a hundred Negative ones. Mr. Wills very diſingenious.

But that the Reader may be *ſatisfied*, I had good *warrants*, to juſtify my ſaid *proofs*, and that it was not my *Ipſe dixit* only, I ſhall give them briefly to you, with what I have ſince met with, to confirm the ſame, which are as followeth, *viz.*

Firſt, From what is mentioned of *Donatus* himſelf, who, as *Sebaſtian Frank* in his *Chronicle* ſaith, *did teach, that no Infant ſhould be baptiſed, but only thoſe, that believed, and deſired it*, p. 222. Donatus himſelf.

Secondly, from what we find mentioned, of his Followers, *viz.* Donatiſts his followers *viz.*

Creſconius, who did *oppoſe Auſtin in that point*, as ſaith *Jacob Merning*, p. 230, *who was a Donatiſt, as ſay the* Magdeb. Cent. 5. p. 631. 1. Creſconius.

Fulgentius, another *learned Donatiſt*, as the Magdeb. tell us Cent. 5. p. 631. *did deny Infants Baptiſme, and aſſert only that Baptiſme, that was after Faith*, Vicecom. L. 3. c. 3. p. 66. 2. Fulgentius.

Vincentius Victor, another *who denyed Infants Baptiſme*, as ſaith Vicom. L. 1. c. 2. *out of Auſtin lib.* 3. *c.* 14 *de Anima*. Vincentius.

Austin. Thirdly, It doth appear, from what we find in *Austin* 3. *and* 4. Books Tom. 7. c. 23. p. 433. *written against the Donatists*, wherein with so much *zeal*, and *fury*, he manageth the Argument for Infants Baptisme against them, bitterly *cursing* those that *oppose it*, p. 123. Also in his Epistle to *Marcellus* Tom. 7. c. 6. p. 724. *he opposeth himself against them, for denying Infants Baptisme.*

Eckbertus & Emericus. Fourthly, *Eckbertus*, and *Emericus*, learned Writers in the twelfeth Century, contending against the *Waldenses*, or Catheri, *for denying Infants Baptisme, do say, that the new* Catheri, viz. *the Waldenses then, did in that point conform to the old* Catheri, *the Donatists, and Novations*, p. 224.

Tho. Waldenus. *Thomas Waldon*, that wrote against *Wickliff*, in *Henry* the *fourth*'s time, tells us, *that* Vincentius Victor, *with whom* Austin *contended, did deny Baptisme to little ones*, De Sacram. Tit. 5. ch. 53. fol. 118.

Osiander, Fuller, & Bullinger. Fifthly, Our latter Writers, do also agree herein, that the *Donatists*, and modern *Anabaptists*, were all one; *so saith Osiander*, Cent. 16. p. 176. *And Fuller in his Eccles. Histor.* lib. 5. pag. 229. *And Bullinger* Lib. 5. fol. 216, 222. *of Baptisme.*

Spanhem. *Spanhemius* also, saith, *that the Donatists deny Infants Baptisme, as appears, saith he, Austin 6. Book against the Donatists*, c. 23, 24, 25. Spanh. ch. 4. p. 45.

Sixthly, Because the *Donatists*, and *Novatians*, both one in Doctrine, were acknowledged to be the same in Principle with the *Waldenses*, and that

that the *Novatians*, banished by *Innocent the third out of Rome, as saith Socrat.* L. 7, c. 9. did dwell in *Italy*, *and Dalmatia*, and were called by the same name with the *Waldenses*, viz. *Cathari*, and Fratricilli, in so much as *Perin* judges, they were the same *People*; and *Osiander* confesseth, that the *Albigois* came from *Rome*, Cent. 13. l. 1. ch. 4. p. 329.

Therefore it is left to the judicious *Reader*, whether I am not sufficiently justifyed, by this six fold *testimony* in my affirming, that the *Donatists* did deny *Infants* Baptisme; and that they may well be reckoned amongst the *number of my witnesses*, and against whom Mr. *Wills* has made no just *Exception*.

But in the next place, Mr. *Wills* tells us, *that if it be taken for granted, they were against Infants Baptisme, they being, as he confesseth, in many things so like Anabaptists, yet by what appears from Mr.* Fox, *as he tells us out of* Eusebius, *and from Austins works, as far the Magdeburgs, that I have no reason to boast of my Authority, for both* Novations, and Donatists, *were vile Persons, and always counted for Hereticks* Mr. Wills slanders the Donatists.

To which I say, that if I should *acknowledge* them as corrupt, as *Origen, Cyprian, Austin, and Chrysostom*, and others of his great witnesses, that held for *Chrysme, Exorcisme*, and other *superstitions*, and that *Regeneration* was effected, in the very *act* of Baptisme, and that without *Baptisme*, and the *Eucharist*, no Child could be saved, yet their witness as to matter of fact, is to be owned, which is all I produce them for, not Answered.

undertaking to defend them, in all the Tenets fathered upon *them*, more then Mr. *Wills* doth those that are so undenyably charged upon his witnesses, yet this he must give me leave to say, in vindication of the *Donatists*, and *Novatians*, *viz.*

First, For the *Novations*, that what Mr. *Fox* speaks of them, from *Eusebius*, an Author of no great *fame*, is the less to be regarded, because he was a great friend to the *Arians*, and the *Novations* great *Impugners* of them, and upon that score it was he spoke very *malitiously* of them; though *Socrates*, an Author of better Account, speaks very honourably of them; And *Albaspanæus upon Optat. Milevitan.* *bespeaks them a very worthy People, in his 20. Observation.*

Magd. say no mention in old Writers of their Dogmes.

And as for the *Donatists*, the *Magdeburgs* tell us, that they wonder, that there is no more mention of them by the Ecclesiastical Writers, of this Age, either by *Sozamus*, or others; and that only *Theodoret*, in his Heretical Fables, gives some hints of them; And that the *Hypotheses* of their *Dogmes*, they gathered not from any of their *writings*, which were not extent, but out of *Austins* works, [*their great Opposer*] Cent. 4. c. 5. p. 376, 377. and from whom it is that Mr. *Wills* takes his *scheame*.

But how any can take a good *measure* from their severest *Enemy*, to make a judgement against them, and condemn them for *Hereticks*, I not; for may you not from *Calvins* writ- pick as great a charge against the *Lutherans* and as great against the Sacramentarians,

out

out of *Lurkers* writings? Alas what a sad People, doth Mr. *Edwards* make the Independents; and what a dismal black line, do the *Prelates* draw upon the Presbyterians; and the Papists again upon them; and what a sad generation are Anabaptists, if Mr. *Wills* may be believed; Schisme being in all the incensing crime, which draws forth all the gall, and wormwood; and just so it was betwixt *Austin*, who was so *Catholick* in his Communion, and the Donatists, that prest for more purity in their separations, and from whence it was; that all that durt was flung upon them, and they put into such Bears skins, as Mr. *Wills* puts his Opposites in.

And for those Decrees of Councels, that past upon them for Hereticks, is no good ground to conclude against them, for so they judge the purest Doctrine, and holyest walking in many Ages, witness our Saviour himself, who was censured for a Blasphemer, and the Apostles, and Saints in every Age ever since; and who more censured for Heresy, then the *Waldenses*, *Lollards*, and *Wickliffians*, their Followers, and Disciples, that were so truly Orthodox.

The Witness said to be born against Infants Baptisme, by the Antient Britains, *defended.*

THe last witness he opposeth, is that born by the *Antient Britains*, and that they denyed Infants Baptisme, I gave the following *Arguments*, and which you have at large, p. 226. Antient Britains.

First,

Why they deny'd Infants Baptisme.

"First, Because Mr. *Fox* tells us, out of *Bede*, "and *Fabian*, and others, that they refused to bap- "tise after the manner of Rome, which *Fabian* "as I find, more particularly explains, to be in the "point of Infants Baptisme; and in confirmation "thereof gave five Arguments. First, *Becaus* "they kept themselves, both in Discipline, and Do- "ctrine, so expresly to the Scripture, (there being "no expres Scripture for Infants Baptisme, as "confest on all hands.) Secondly; Because they "were such zealous impugners of Tradition, that "being as Austin confesseth, the only Divine Autho- "rity for it. Thirdly, *Because* Constantine, *the* "*Son of Christian Parents, was not baptised in* "*this Island in his Infancy.* Fourthly, *Because* "their custom was to baptise after Confession of "Faith, being in Union and Communion therein "with the *French Christians*, whereof Instances "are given. Fifthly, *From the Question that was* "*here put to Austin*; viz. *how long a Child, that* "*was in danger of death, might stay unbaptised? which he could not resolve, till he sent to* Rome *for the Solution. And to which we may add*, what the Magdeburgs tell us from *Hilaries* testimony, p. 55. *that none but the Adult were baptised, in the Western Churches, in his time.*

Mr. Wills opposeth Fabians testimony from Bede

To which he replyes as followeth: *First, as to that of Fabians testimony, he saith, it is only a mistaken Paraphrase of* Bede; *and that* Bede *mentions nothing hereof. And therefore gives what* Austin *replyed to the* Brittains, *in* Bedes *words* L. 2. c. 2. *viz. That in as much as you do contrary to our Custom* [*in many things*] *yea to the Custom of the Uni-*

Universal Church, nevertheless if you will obey me in these 3. things, viz. *that you keep Easter in its proper time; Administer Baptisme, whereby we are born of God, after the manner of the Church of* Rome, *and the Apostolical Church; and preach the Word of God, together with us, unto the English Nation, we will patiently bear all other things you do, although contrary to our Customes; but they answered, they would none of these, nor own him for Arch-bishop.*

To which I say, that it doth appear from his Repetition out of *Bede*. that *Fabian* has fully hit his *meaning*; *First*, Because he tells, the British Christians, that amongst many things where in they were contrary to the Church of *Rome*, one was in this particuler about Baptisme, wherein they did not only contradict the Universal, but Apostolick Church. Now this must needs be in their refusing to *baptise* Children; First, Because as to the baptizing the *Adult*, they were not contrary to the Church of *Rome*, the Universal, or Apostolical Church, as appears p. 228. Secondly, Neither could it respect the particuler *Mode*, Rite, or *Ceremony* of Baptisme; for the Custom of the Church of *Rome* was not *Universal*, which was so much opposed by the Greeks, and Eastern Churches, and not at all to be made out to be *Apostolical*. Thirdly, Therefore must needs respect Infants *Baptisme*: First, Because the Church of *Rome* had particularly *enjoined*, and *supposed* it, to beget Infants to *Regeneration*, that they might be born of *God*, as the words of their Canons demonstrate, and which words carry the Rea-

Answer. Fabian did not mistake Bede and why.

Reason, and ends of it, and that they intended the substance, and not the particuler Ceremony of the Ordinance. Secondly, Because Infants Baptisme was so universaly received in this seventh Age, in other parts of the World, to this end here mentioned. Thirdly, Because it was also received, and *enjoined* to be an *Apostolical practise*. Fourthly, It would have been *Childish*, and *ridiculous*, to have said Baptisme in general was *Apostolical*, which none ever denyed, and so fully before received by them; therefore *Austin* could intend nothing else, nor *Bedes* words import any thing else; which therefore *Fabian* did so fully, and significantly represent, in saying, *give Christendom to Children*, viz. *let them as the Church of Rome has received, and enjoined it, be born of God by Baptisme, and become Christians, as so generaly also received.*

And for Mr. *Wills* saying, *They did no more reject Infants Baptisme, then they did preaching to the Saxons with Austin*; Is very true, having as much Reason to reject the one, as the other, for by preaching here with them, must be understood Authoritively, by being ordained by them, that they might not preach, as they did, as a company of Lay-men, and Mechanicks, but to be set apart thereto by this Apostolical Embassidor, [or proud *Lordly Prelat*,] which they refused, not admitting him therein, to be their Arch-Bishop, and which explains *Austins meaning in the business* of preaching, and their denying thereof; which they had as good Cause to do, as to deny their Romish Infants Baptisme. and their Superstitious, Observation

vation of Easter; And therefore it was, that this Ante Christian Wolf did devoure, and worry this Flock of Christ, because they refused the *Popish Baptisme*, and *Ministry*. Secondly, As to those five other *Arguments* given by me, to confirm the former, he saith, they are meer *trifles*, (which is an Excellent way of *Answering*, and next to *Bellarmin* thou lyest) which is submitted to judgement.

And Lastly, He gives another Argument, why the *Brittains* were not against Infants Baptisme; viz. Because *Pelagius who, as he saith, was one of their Fellow Monks of Bangor, yet did owne Infants Baptisme; which was two hundred years before this, and which was a good Argument, that they did also*

Mr. Wills saith, Pelagius was a Monk of Bangor, & for Infants Baptisme.

To which I say, that as to *Pelagius* being one of these Old *Brittains*, and belonging to this very People, is by no good Authority to be found; For though it is true; *Humphry*, *Loyd* and Mr. *Fuller*, do so guess, yet they produce no Antient Author to confirm it; It is true, in *Austins* 106. Epist. he is called *Pelagius Brito*, to distinguish him from another *Pelagius* of *Tarentius*; but whether because he was sent into that Nation, or of it, not certain.

Questionable.

But Secondly, If it be granted, that he was a *Brittain*, and *one* of these Monks, it no more follows, that they must all be for *Infants Baptisme*, because he was so, then that they were all for the *Pelagian Heresy*. because he was the head thereof; which it is eminently *known* they *rejected*, when they sent for the help of those famous *French* Christians, *Germanus*, and *Lupus*, who were

It follows not that the Brittains where of his judgement, & why.

sent to them again, and again, from the Elders, and Ministers about *Lyons*, to expel that Poyson; and therefore do I call them the *Waldesian Christians*, who inhabited those parts where their abode was, *Magdeb.* Cent. 5. p. 1147, &c.

[An Hist. Account of Pelagius] But as to *Pelagius*, the Magdeburgs do give us this Account of him, from *Austin*, and *Lucelbergius*, Cent. 5. pag. 1453. *viz. that he was full of zeal, and affection, and that his beginning was good, and holy* (so that, if he was a Monk of Bangor, he began well) *And that by the Catholicks he was preferred, and made one of the Monks of Syria, and that having lived long at* Rome, *went from thence into* England, *which Island he wholy infected with his Error* (by which it appears, that if he was one of that Society, yet that he got his poyson abroad, both of one kind, and of another) *That after he fell into this Error, he wrote many Books, and many Epistles to the learned Men of this Age, whereby he infested the Universal Church; And several Fathers opposed him*, viz. *Jerom, Austin, and others, and that his Books were condemned by many Synods, and Councels*, Magdeb. Cent. 5. pag. 894. 586, 587.

Now therefore what ground Mr. *Wills* hath to conclude, the History of those Churches, and his Book also, in that manner he doth, is submitted to his better consideration, and the Judicious Reader, and which they find in the following words, *viz.*

And in reference to the confidence of my Antagonist, that the Waldenses, Donatists, *and* Brittains, *were against Infants Baptisme, when none of them were*

were, I shall conclude with a Distich, which I think may not improperly be applyed to his whole Discourse:

Ridiculus tandem ecce Cavis Mus prodit ab antris,
Quem gravidi Montes perturiere din.

And from what hath been said, I see no Reason why Mr. D. should be so much offended with Mr. Marshal, and Mr. Baxter, for saying Infants Baptisme was but lately opposed, by the Anabaptists in Germany, and do appeal to the Reader, whether Mr. Baxter doth not speak true, in his plain Scripture proof, pag. 153. who saith, that for his part he cannot find in his small reading, any one Divine, or party of Men, did certainly oppose, or deny Infants Baptisme, for many hundred years after Christ. And then again p. 261. the World may see, what a cause you put such a face upon, when you cannot give the least proof, so much as of one Man (we will allow them one, viz. Hincmarus: what not Adrianus too? that is hard,) much less Societies, and least of all godly Societies, that did once oppose, or deny Infants Baptisme, from the Apostles dayes, till about Luthers time.

Amongst

Amongſt the ſeveral Erratas committed by the Preſs, the Reader is deſired to correct theſe that follow, *viz.*

Pag. 4. *l.* laſt, *r.* cleanſing. *p.* 5. *l.* 6. *r.* it. *p.* 6. *l.* 7. *r.* excepts. *l.* 13. *r.* four. *p.* 7. *l.* 20. blot out *firſt*. *l.* 22. *r.* Baptiſme. *p.* 9. *l.* 7. *r.* it, *for* is. *l.* 26. *r.* there were. *pag.* 19. *l.* 27. *r.* their. *p.* 20. *l.* 19. *r.* their. *p.* 21. *l.* 13. *r.* words. *p.* 30. *l.* 27. *r.* infamy. *p.* 35. *l.* 25. *r.* theſe. *p.* 36. *l.* 19. *r.* he cites. *p.* 44. *l.* 24. *r.* ſpeaks. *p.* 45. *l.* 15. *r.* bearing. *l.* 24 *r.* has. *p.* 59. *l.* 26. *r.* At cum. *p.* 80. *l.* 29. *r.* the, *for* they. *p.* 86. *l.* 26. *r.* ad Romanos incertus eſt. *p.* 88. *l.* laſt, *r.* Arminianiſme, *for* Arianiſme. *p.* 95. *l.* 24. *r.* for. *l.* 27. *r.* both a like. *p.* 100. *l.* 24. *r.* for. *p.* 101. *l.* 13. *r.* Paraphraſe. *p.* 105. *l.* 26 *r.* Giſlbertus. *p.* 107. *l.* 9. *r.* impoſing, *for* Fathering. *p.* 114. *l.* l. laſt, *r.* that ſhould. *p.* 115. 5 *r.* is I think, *for* which I think is. *p.* 122. *l.* 8. *r.* *for* what were, were *p.* 125 *l.* 17. *r.* affirms, *for* deny. *p.* 128. *l.* 19. *r.* had Schools. *p.* 148. *l.* 23. 29. *r.* tell, *for* tells. *p.* 159. *l.* 19. *r.* Fifthly, *for* Fifty. *l.* 20. *r.* the, *for* them. *pag.* 158. *l.* 8. *r.* profeſs. *l.* 14. blot out *a*. *p.* 142. *l.* 4. *r.* Armes, *for* Armies. *In the Preface* Miniſts, *for* Minuſters.

CHAP. IV.

Wherein you have the Stories concerning the German Anabaptists *reviewed, and the Principles and Practise of* Anabaptistry (*as Mr.* Wills *calls it*) *vindicated against his reproaches.*

IN the reflection I made upon the Story of *Tho. Munzer*, and *John of Leyden*, for whose sakes so much *obliquity* hath been cast upon the *Anabaptists* and their way, ever since, I principally intended these two things. First, to shew the *unreasonableness* of charging the *innocent* with the crimes of such as are *guilty*. And to this Mr. *Wills* in the general *consents*, though he tells us withall, the *suspicion he hath, of the Principle of Anabaptistry itself*. What before said hereto.

Secondly, I gave a brief *account* of matter of *fact*, and therein shewed that those *Germane commotions* were not *Anabaptistical* in their *Original*, but moved upon the same pretentions, as the *Helvetians* and others before them had done; then gave the reasons why I thought there was ground to doubt of the *truth* of what was reported concerning the horrid *crimes* committed by them in their *communities*.

Mr. Wills Objections.

In answer hereunto Mr. *Wills* reproves me. First, *for denying those motions to be Anabaptistical.* Secondly, *for making an odious Comparison betwixt those commotions and them in Helvetia*, p. 103. Thirdly, for *mistaking matter of fact in the Original of the Munster commotion.* Fourthly, As *being extreamly scandalous for my doubts concerning those horrid impieties in Munster.* And Fifthly, he *charges the Principle it self as naturally leading to immorality and division.*

To these I make this brief reply.

Why the Commotions in Swevia not Anabaptistical.

First, that the *Commotions in Swevia* 1635. were not *Anabaptistical* appears by their twelve demands, which you have mentioned at large by *Osiander* Cent. 16. c. 36. p. 100. *Wherein is not one word favouring of Anabaptism, but about freedom from Exactions, and to deliver themselves from the Tyranny (as they say) of their Princes and Bishops more Helvetiorum* (which *Gnodalius* also informs us, as I before mentioned) being much of the same nature with those other *Demands* made by the *Rusticks* twenty three Years before (which was the Year after the Revolt of *Berne* and *Schasthusen*) of which you have also an account in *Osiander Cent.* 16. *L.* 1. c. 6. p. 10. And that these commotions were not *fomented* and principally *managed* by the *Anabaptists* may appear; First from those first *Demands*, which were principally made and managed by the *Papists*; as *Osiander* and *Bishop Jewel* against *Harding* in-

inform, and the Articles themselves express; and that the Latter Demands in 1625. were principally carried on by the *Lutherans*; (though it is true *Luther* afterwards Writ against them) as *Osiander* tells us. In which *attempt also that Year fell of them* (as *Paget* in his *Heriſography informs us*) *one hundred and fifty thouſand*: the hundred part whereof could not be *Anabaptiſts*.

To the ſecond he tells us *it is both odious and injurious, to compare thoſe attempts of* Geneva *and the* Switzers *with thoſe in* Swevia, *when none, as he ſaith, can be ſuch Diabolls as to charge the* Switzers *with Robbing the Nobility, Plundring of Towns, and Caſtles, Riſling of all that was Sacred, as thoſe* Germans *did.*

To which I ſay, that the Chronicles themſelves can beſt inform how thoſe *Cantons* formerly, and thoſe of *Baſil. Strasbuſen* and *Geneva* ſince did manage their *Conſiderabiel*, ſurprize their *Towns* and *Caſtles*, diſpoſeſs their *Princes*, and *Biſhops*; and poſſeſs themſelves of their *Revenues* Civil and Eccleſiaſtical. For my part I am yet to learn (from what ever I read) where the difference lay in the attempts, only that thoſe Cantons had better Conduct and *proſpered*, and the other had neither *Conduct* nor *Succeſs*, but miſcarried in both; which if the other had done; as much *obloquy* might have befallen them. And you'l find ſome *Proteſtant* Writers as well as *Popiſh* to charge as much *irregularity* on the undertaking of the *one*, as of the *other*;

Why the Compariſons not odious as charged.

who will tell you that the *Boores* in *Germany*, and they of *Munster*, might as warrantably turn out their *Princes*, *Bishops*, and *Canons*; and possess themselves of their *Revenues*, as *Geneva*, and those of *Helvetia* had done. And we are not ignorant of the several attempts that the City of *Munster* hath made within a few years, since wholly *Popish*, to deliver themselves from the *Exactions* of their *Bishop*, which by the *Bishop* hath been esteemed no less seditious and *rebellious*, than the former.

Thirdly as to the Originall of the Munster commotion, though he grants the turning out of the Bishops, Cannons, &c. out of the Churches, and the City also, by the Reformists. *Yet tells me, I speak falsely in saying, that Spanhemius tells us that it came to Arms betwixt the Bishops and City, who saith the quite contrary, and tells us (as he saith) that it never came to blows.*

That the first stirrs in *Munster* was about Protestant Reformation..

To which I say, my words you I find are these, *viz.* *That Sphanhemius* and *Osiander* tells us, that the first stirrs in the City was about the *Protestant Reformation*, the Senate siding with *Retman* and others of the *Ministers* against the *Papists* and their Bishops, that opposed them to Arms, and this before the coming in of *John a Leyden*.

Mr. Wills very partial.

I say *Spanhemius* and *Osiander* tells us, &c. He takes notice only of the former, and it is manifest they both of them speak of those first stirs about turning out the Bishops, Canons, *Span-*

Spanhemius it is true speaks very briefly of the difference and *Agreement* that happened betwixt the *Bishop* and *Senate* thereupon, Though I must tell *Mr. Wills* it is his mistake to say, that *Spanhemius* demes it came to Armies; for he saith no such thing; But *Osiander* from *Sleyden* goes to particulars: And tells us, how the *Bishop* drew a Force down to a Neighbouring Village called *Telgeto*, stopt and streightned them of provision (for so saith *Sleiden*) And sent messengers to command the *restoring* of the *Canons* to their *Churches* again, and the turning out of Town the new *Preachers*: But how that instead thereof they detayned his *Messengers*, and sent a party out of the *Town* in the *Night* and *surprized* and brought away Prisoners, diverse of the *Bishops* men; and that he himself had been taken also, if he had not gone out of his Quarters, that *Night* before. And if this could be done without Arms, and Blows, let all Men judge: and whether the reproof doth not more properly belong to *Mr. Wills* than my self therein.

Fourthly, As to the *Suspicion* (why I supposed there was cause to doubt) of the truth of those monsterous Villanyes acted in their Communities in the Latter part of the Siege, as mentioned by their malitious enemies the *Papists*, and many of their inveterate enemies the *Protestants*, *He saith it is extreamly scandalous in two respects; First for calling into Question the matter of fact, especially as reported by the Protestants, who were not* (as he saith) *inve-*

terate enemies, but very loving friends to them. And *Secondly*, For endeavouring to palliate such horrid alkings of the *Anabaptists*, a thing never done by any.

Why cause to suspect some of the reports about *Munster*.

In answer whereto I say let it in the first place be remembred, that as to the first part of my suspicion, why those horrid enormities reported might be scandals, *viz.* From the reports given them by the lying *Papists* (who speak as bad things of *Calvin* and *Luther* themselves, and of the Waldenses before them, as you have heard) he seems silently to own. But his great offence lies against me for *questioning* the truth of what is said thereof by the *Protestant* Writers such as *Sleiden*, *Osiander*, *Spanhemius*, *Zwinglius*, &c. who were (as he saith) *most faithful historians, grave Divines, and who gave punctually the Circumstances of time, place, opinions, &c. And from whom he transcribes the Story: And that my injurious refutation upon them, as though they were the Anabaptists invetcrate enemies and that they were willing to take up and improve such reports, to blast not only the whole party of the Anabaptists but their Principles also, against whom they contended, savour in me* (as he saith) *of no less than the ebullition of a Malicious, or at best a prejudiciall Spirit.*

first from Papists.

Secondly, Several Protestants

To which I say, how shall we be assured, that these later writers did not make their Reports from the *Popish Writers*. For *Sleiden* wrote not his *Comentary* till 1555. about twenty years after the fact, and *Osiander* only transcribes from *Sleiden*

Steiden. And as for *Spanhemius* he wrote not till eighty years after *Steiden.* upon whom *Mr. Wills* lays the greateſt ſtreſs, and who appears to be a *very partial* and *unfaithful writer* reſpecting the *Anabaptiſts* in that his Hiſtoricall Narration printed 1646. Firſt falſely affirming that *Stork, Stubner, and Muntzer, were the beginners of Anabaptiſm*, and who *Firſt* (as his own words expreſs) *helpt the world to be delivered of that Sect.* Secondly *in his malicious charging the Anabaptiſts with all the old Hereſies, that he could reckon up in any old Author, viz. That they were Manicheans, Andians, Anthropomorphites, Tritheits, Samoſatenians, Noetians, and Sabellians: Apollinariſts, and Prodamites, Anaſtatians, Neſtorians, Eutichians, Corinthians, Photinians, Oregenians: Catharists, Novatians, Donatiſts, Parmenians, Marcionites, Eunomians, Montaniſts, Nicolaites, Baſilidians, Catephrigians, Gnoſticks, Pelagians, and Socinians.* All which Opinions, he enlargeth upon, and applies to them, then which what could favour more of the ebullition of a Malicious Spirit?

And as for *Zwinglius* he could give no account of his buſineſs, who dyed five years before it, viz. 1531. But as to this great friendſhip (*Mr. Wills* boaſts of) *By the gentleneſs and tenderneſs that he ſhewed to thoſe anabaptiſts, that fell off from his Church, whom he treated not as Enemies, but as his intimate friends* (as he tells us) I ſhall give you ſome particular *account*, wherein you will find what is that

Zwinglius cruel Enemy with the Anabaptiſts.

Kindness and *Gentleness*, it seems we might expect from *Mr. Wills* if it was in his power.

It is true at first *Zwinglius* was a great Friend and *Companion* of the *Anabaptists*, and a great favourer of their opinion in *opposition* to that of *Infants Baptism*, as *Treat. Bapt.* p. 262.

But afterwards who more *Cruel* amongst the Bloody *Papists* themselves than he, as you have a *particular* account from those edicts of *Zurick*, wherein he had the principal hand, p. 260. And the *Inhumane Execution* of them by *drowning, burning, and Starving*. It is true to palliate this Cruelty, *Mr. Wills* tells us from *Spanhemius*, that they suffered not these severities for being *Anabaptists but as perjured, disobedient and seditious persons*, which is a farther discovery of his malice and unfaithfullness.

The cruel handling of the Anabap. at *Zanc.*

For those very decrees of *Zurick* extracted by me proved, out of the *Dutch Martyrology*, where they are inserted word for word, do testify *that it was meerly upon the account of their Judgment for baptizing after profession, those that had been baptized in their Infancies*. And to confirm the same, *Gastius* tells us. L. 1. p. 178. That the Figurines (or those of *Zurick*) *do drown them in Water, who do baptize those that were baptized before*. And Hornbeck in his Summa Controvers. p. 340. Gives us a pregnant instance thereof, telling us, That *Felix Menzius of Zurick, was by the Command of the Magistrate (whose laws and authorities he had broke by proceeding to rebaptize*

persons within their Jurisdiction) was himself drowned in water upon 5th. Jan. Anno 1573. And this was Zwinglius his Kindness to his intimate Friends and Brethren (this Merrix having been an ancient Disciple and an Eminent preacher) And much the like friendship they met with from their *Protestant Friends* at *Berne* and *Schaffhuisen* as you have it p. 316. And therefore it was no wonder, if they could be so *prodigal of their lives* that they should be so *lavish* of their *Reputations*; for the latter would only help to *justifie* the *former*: for just in like manner did the *Papists* deal with the *Albigenses* in Innocent the third his time, the better to cover over their murderous and bloody cruelties against them.

And as to the second part of his exception against my suspicion, which he calls a pallia- ting of those horrid Crimes, and repeats it as if I tyed it only to the actions of *Jo. Matthias*, and *John of Leydon*, when I mentioned my suspicion of what was *reported* to be done by the *whole party* in the *Communities* in the later part of the Siege: Whereof the Publick Stock might give some *occasion* of Report (as it had done, as I observed, amongst the *Waldenses* of old, as though with their Goods they had the Women also in common too.) But for these following Reasons Mr. *Wills* must bear with me, if I do not as yet recive it. First because, I cannot imagine those five Godly and Learned Ministers, viz. *Bernard Rothmann*, men- *Herman Strapede*, *Henricus Rullius*, *Godfrid Straling*,

Why ground to suspect those horrid things reported to be done at *Munster*.

First Reason.

Straling, *Julius Frisius*, and others, who had been so successful in the work of Conversion in that place (as is *confessed*) and so many *sober Citizens*, who had with them embraced that Judgment of Baptism after Faith, could so soon *renounce* all Godliness and *Honesty*, so as to practice, or give countenance to such unheard of *Impieties*, and Villanies. 2*dly*, because *Merno Simonis* (of whom *Cassander* saith, *there were in him and his Followers tokens of a godly mind*, saith thus in his Book of *Fundamentals* concerning this People, *viz. I doubt not but those our beloved Brethren who lately did sin against God by defending their Faith with Arms are in the Favour of God.* And Mr. *Robert Bailie* in his *Anabaptism*, p. 36. saith the *Mennonites themselves the ill best* of all who carryed the name of *Anabaptists*, though *they Anathematize the Georgians Heresie*, yet *they approve so far of the Monasterians, that they do much excuse all their wicked practices, and put no doubt of their Saintship and acceptation with God, notwithstanding the Crimes the world charges upon them.* And what can his signifie but the *Mennonists* disbelief of the Crimes objected against that wicked Community of the Anabaptists, for had they beleived it, they would much more have renounced such moral Impietys, than that of their beating defensive Arms, which they so witnessed against.

Second The Ministers a sober people did not charge it upon them.

Third Ber. many of them very holy Martyrs.

Thirdly, Another Argument why I judge these *German* Anabaptists were not given up to such Uncleanness and *Wickedness* is, because so many of them did (upon the *Emperours*

bloudy

bloody Placaet,) about this time, as well before and after, so *chearfully* seal their holy profession with their blood, twenty of them were Martyred in the *Palatinate*, *An.* 1529. and 350 more in *Alsatia* the same year, and many hundreds more of them suffered upon the same *accounts*, some by *burning*, some by *drowning*, and some by *beheading*; of whom, the *Dutch* Book of Martyrs gives an annual account. And therefore *Beza* in his *Epistle to* the Gallo-belgick *Churches*, as Embden *saith*, *many of the Anabaptists are good men, Servants of God, Martyrs of Christ, and our most dear Brethren. Quosdam inter Anabaptistas esse bonos, veros servos Dei, Christi Martyres, & charissimos fratres nostros.* Hornbeck *Summa Controvers. L.* 5. p. 364.

But *Mr. Wills* his chief improvement of this Story is yet behind; Which is fitly, not only to render the Professors them of vile and contemptible, but the *Principle it self* corrupt and *detestable*. And *therefore in words at length tells us both from himself and others, that the Principle of Anabaptism is false and dangerous; and a Principle of darkness: upon which many black Characters are Writ. And is all this to the purpose indeed? and beyond all that he hath said? And therefore he might have saved himself, the World, and me the trouble, of his great Book in detecting my mistakes in History, and the many falsehoods, that he pretends me guilty of, and the Refuting of my* Arguments; but rather *singly* betook himself to this *alone*:

for

for if he has *discovered* the rottenness of the *Principle*, he need do no more.

But then the Question is, how he makes this *appear*? which you'll find he endeavors *to do* by two Arguments. First, from the *wickedness* and *immorality* of those that *profess* it. Secondly the rigid and dividing nature of the Principle *it self*.

Mr. Wills Reason why the Prim. is corrupt.

First, from the immorality of the *Professors* of it. Telling us, p. 94. *That we may safely affirm that Doctrine is to be suspected false, which is usually attended with gross miscarriages in the Professors of it: for that speaks the Doctrine Ominous, and looks like a Spiritual Judgement of God upon it. And I heartily wish there were no ground to say, that of such a Nature is the Doctrine of Baptizing grown Persons, in opposition to that of Infants Seed of Believers. Evidenced by the wicked lives of those in Germany, and the Blasphemies and immoralities of divers Persons of our own Nation. And again p. 106. That the Tumultuous and Rebellious carriages of those in Germany did proceed not so much from the distempered Brains of some, but from their opinions, and the very constitution of their Sect, by which it will be somewhat difficult to make it out how it may not be therefore chargeable upon all.*

Answered Principles may not be tryed by any thing but the Scripture, and why

In answer hereunto, I say in the first place, That Mr. *Wills* takes a wrong *measure*, and sets up a false *Standard*. By judging the *goodness*, or *badness* of *Principles*, or Doctrines, by the *goodness* or *badness* of the Men

that

that profess them; because Men may have good Conversations, that have rotten Principles, witness the Scribes and Pharises, of old, the Jesuites, and Quakers, since; that may be Woolves, in Sheeps Clothing, and Devils in the shape of Angels of Light. And on the contrary, Men may have good Principles, and yet very unsuitable Conversations, witness the Professors, both under the Law, and under the Gospel: for whence was it, that God destroy'd and removed his People, of old, pull'd down the Tabernacle, and both Temples, and sent them into Captivity; but for the wickedness of their lives? as Jerry 2. to verse 17. 1. Cor. 10. 1. to 12. And whence was it, that God removed his Candlestick, from those famous first Churches in the New Testament; but for the evil of their doing? must we therefore conclude, that because their Conversations were so bad under both; that therefore their Principle, and Profession it self, was nought, and led thereunto, by no means? let God be true, and every Man a lyage for this would be to reproach the truth in every sight.

Therefore nothing but the Infallible Rule of Gods Word, can be the proper Standard to try Doctrines by, according to particular direction in the Case, Isa. 8. 20. Gal. 1. 8. 1. Joh. 4. 1. 2. &c. And the reason is, because all Men are failable, and at best are but Men.

But in the next place, we will trace Mo-

Wills

Wills in his further proofs, and try whether he be able to make good his uncharitable, not to say malicious, charge, whereby you will be the better able to judge whether the Foundation of his Argument is not slander and false accusation.

Mr. Wills proof fails to these of the Blasphemies and imoralities of the German Anabaptists.

The Principle *saith he is false, because they are usually so that profers it and that they are usually so appears, first by the horrid errors, and wicked lives of those in* Germany, *and by the blasphemy and immoralities of divers in our own Nation.* But how doth he prove the one or the other.

First, how he proves the *German Anabaptists* to be so a erronious as you have heard by *Sphanhemius* his lying fictions and *camera's*. But concerning whose Orthadox Faith and Doctrine, you have an Account in the *Dutch* book of Martyrs; first by their *publick* owning the Articles of Faith exhibited by the *Waldenses* in the twelfth Cent. Recorded at large by *Perin*, and divers other Authors; and which they Sealed with their *Blood* through all the parts of *Germany*, *France*, *Italy*, *&c.* In the several Ages ever since: whereof you have a faithful memorial in their Book of *Martyrs* from time to time. And who withall do give a punctual account of those latter *conventions* of their *Elders* out of all the Provinces in the Low *Countries*, *Germany*, *Flanders*, *France*, *&c. viz.* one at *Amsterdam*, 27. *September* 1627. And the other at *Dort*, 21. *April*, 1632. Where the old Waldesian Articles were *Subscribed* and

pub-

Published; and which you have at large with the Scriptures *annexed* in the said Book of Martyrs, called the *Bloody Theatre*, Printed at *Dort* 1660. By which you have an account, that the *Anabaptists* in *Germany* were not such *desperate Hereticks*, as Mr. *Wills* so untruly *suggests*; not but that I judge there were erronious Persons, both in former and latter times, that own'd the Doctrine of Baptism after Faith both in *Germany* and *England*, and we find the purest Churches in the Primitive times, were not free from *Hereticks* of all sorts. Neither I presume will Mr. *Wills* our Accuser himself undertake, that the Doctrine of *Pedobaptisme* doth secure from the grossest errors that are asserted. Therefore since the Articles of Faith that have been, and are own'd, by those *Churches* are so sound and Orthodox, there is no cause so to reproach them as *Spanheimius* before; and Mr. *Wills* that now Writes after his Coppy. And thus much for their Doctrine.

Then as to the Commotions and *Rebellions* that he tells us the way of *Anabaptisme* stirred up in *Suevia* and *Munster* from the same Author; And what unheard of Villanies were perpetrated in that City, hath been already considered, and the proofs tendred for the same; which I presume is such *evidence* that no Court of Justice, nor any upright Man can pass a Judgement upon. And truly, if matter of Fact cannot be better told us at home, witness those many false Stories Mr.

Ed.

Edwards in his Gangrene, Fathered upon them; and Mr. *Baxter* in his report of their Baptising naked (of neither of which Mr. *Wills* takes any notice) what credit can be given to these forreign *uncertain* Stories?

But if it should be taken for granted, that they in *Swevia* and *Munster* were so *Seditious* and *Rebellious* as Mr. *Wills* from *Spanhamius* would make them, must all the *Anabaptists* in *Germany*, both in that Age, and ever since be so *reputed*, and that their Principle leads thereto also? Yea and those very *Anabaptists* too! that both they, and ever since that, bore witness against bearing of Arms at all; for so did the followers of *Menno Simonis* and *Theodoricus*, as *Cassander* tells us; though so great is Mr. *Wills* his prejudice, that he will not admit thereof; and rather than not make his words good will *adventure* to *translate* the Passage of *Cassander's* Letter to the Duke of *Cleve*, quite contrary to what he expresseth concerning them; which discovers Mr. *Wills* to be either a very heedless Writer, that cares not what he saith, to *blast* the People he Writes against: or that he doth not well *understand* Latin *Author*, or if he do, supposeth by the ignorance of his opposite, he may take the liberty to say any thing of that hand without *controle*: concerning which Passage, he tells us that they, *viz.* The followers of *Menno Simonis* and *Theodoricus*, being as he saith, *imperito quodam Zelo incitati*, *moved by an ignorant Zeal to what they did*, ha-

ving

ving a fancy that they must destroy the wicked per vim externam by force of Arms, and this in order to the setting up the Kingdom of Christ; which Satanical delusion put them on upon such exorbitancies just of the same strain with those called 5th. Monarchy-Men, that put all London into such a fright some years since, as p. 99.

Whereas *Cassander* saith the direct contrary in that very place viz. That *though they were guilty of other mistakes through their ignorant Zeal, Yet tokens of a godly mind might be perceived in them by this that they* (accerime semper resisterunt) *allways resisted the rage of* Munster *and* John Battenburg, *and taught that the Instauration and propogation of Christs Kingdom was only by sufferings.* So that the Reader may perceive that *Cassander* saith the quite contrary to what Mr. *Wills* saith of these People, applying the *Battenburg* and *Munster Principle* of *Resistance* to these People that notoriously held the quite contrary; and therefore doth *Cassander* plead with the *Duke* of *Cleve* for their Liberty, *who were therefore* as he tells him, *Commiseratione potius & emendatione quam insectatione & perditione digni videantur. More worthy of pity and amendment, than persecution and perdition.* So you will understand hereby, that he is an Author not to be much trusted in his Authorities and and Translations.

Whereby Mr. *Wills* would not only have all the *German Anabaptists* to be charged with that of *Munster*, but even those that witnessed

against it also; and is not that very *hard measure?* And would Mr. *Wills* be content to be so dealt with?

For instance, would he think it just and equal, if we should retort his own story upon himself, that he with so much Obliquy reflects upon us, p. 99. And tell him, that because those *Persons* that had the conduct of that affair, that put all *London* into that *fright*, were most-riged *Indipendant Pædobaptists*, as certainly they were, what ever Mr. *Wills* may insinuate to the contrary. That therefore all Rigid *Pædobaptists* (Mr. *Wills* himself in number also) are to be esteemed of the same *mind* and *spirit*, notwithstanding all the *witness* that they, either at that time, or ever since, would be thought to bear against that Action: Yea, and that the very *Principle of Indipendant Pædobaptism* tends to such Rebellious *actions* too, which is his way of dealing with those poor People.

Mr. *Wills* is short in his Proofs against the *Anabaptists* in *England.*

But you may better judge of his *forreign* intelligence and proof, by what he tells us to our faces at home; which every body will be better able to *discern*, and to make a *Judgement* of, viz. *That divers Anabaptists in our own Nation are guilty (as he tells us) of blasphemies and immoralities; and therefore the Principle is false*, &c.

To the making good thereof he brings in Mr. *Baxter* for a Witness, though if he speak any thing to the purpose, the bare affirmation of a Party would, I presume, be judged as incompetent, as if the next that writes,

Writes, should produce Mr. *Wills* his say-so for authentick proof.

But let us hear what Mr. *Baxter* sayth to the point, which he tells us p. 100. In these words, that *though Mr.* Baxter *knew some good and sober Men amongst them; yet that the generality were bad enough: for so (says he) we must understand him in his plain proof* p. 143. *Where he tells us to this purpose; that he had familiarly known very many of them: And that the Ministers were for the most part censorious Opinionatists, who designed to convert People more to their Judgements than to Christ: And that Anabaptistry had been the ordinary inlet to the most horrid opinion, and how negligent many are in Family Duties,* &c. Mr. Baxters Testimony against Anabaptists.

Now therefore let all men judge, whether this amounts to any proof. What if Mr. *Baxter* did know some of their Ministers over Zealous for their Opinion, and some of the people too remiss, and negligent in their Duties to God? doth this prove the Immorality suggested? and for his Apprehensions, that it is the inlet into horrid Opinions? So the Prelates think of *Presbytery* and the Papists of *Protestanism*; is either of them therefore so? and doth that prove them to be *Blasphemers*, and that we must understand by Mr. *Baxters* words, they are for the generality bad enough.

But suppose Mr. *Baxter* in his heat had indeed said what Mr. *Wills* would make him *say*, (which we nowhere find as I know of) yet you will find Mr. *Baxter* in cool blood hath gi-

ven another Character of the *Anabaptists*, of which, because Mr. *Will* will take so little notice, I shall here give it you over again upon this occasion: which, you may be pleas'd to read in his own words, in his Book called, *The Defence of the Principles of Love*, p. 7. viz. that *Anabaptists are Godly men, that differ from us in a point so difficult, that many of the Papists and Prelatists have maintained, that it is not determined in Scripture, but dependeth upon the Tradition of the Church. And I know as good and sober men of that mind, as of theirs that are most against them: And that, I once motioned terms of Concord to the Anabaptists, and was in as hopeful a way for Peace with them, as with most others.* And in his late large Book called *A Christian Directory*, he is pleased to say, p. 287. that *Anabaptists may not only be admitted to Church Communion, but may be tolerated in their practice also.* 1. *Because they agree with us in all points absolutely necessary to Communion.* 2. *That the Antient Christians had liberty either to Baptize, or to let them stay till Age, as they thought best.* 3. *And that the Controversie is of so great difficulty that if in all such Cases, none that differ be tolerated, we may not live together in the World or Church, but endlessly Excommunicate or Persecute one another.*

Mr. *Baxters* late Testimony for the *Anabaptists.*

Now therefore let it be considered, Whether *Mr. Will* hath proved his charge against the *Anabaptists* in *England*, and so consequently, according to his rate of Reasoning, proved their principle false and dangerous?

And

And whether it is not just and equal, that till he make good the same, he ought to be reputed by all men, a Slanderous Person, and a false Accuser of the Brethren, and as justly to be suspected for his Forreign Intelligence, and Accusation also?

Only this I would advise *Mr. Wills*, that when he offers his next *proof*, he be more particular as to the Persons and Crimes he chargeth; as also, since he makes it so *comprehensive*, to take in the Generality of the *Baptists*, and of so great moment as to judge their Principle by also, that the *Blasphemy* and *Immorality* is such as is *foster'd* and *borne with* by the *Churches*, otherwise they are no more chargable with such *Crimes*, if they have cast any such wicked *Persons* out of them, then the Church of *Corinth* was to be charged with Incest, though they had disowned, and Excommunicated the Incestuous Person.

And truly I think I may with much confidence challenge him, or any, the worst of their Enemies, to produce any *Blasphemer*, or immoral Person, so known to be, in any of the *Churches* of Christ under that Denomination. But if any, either in this Nation, in *Germany*, or else where, that have owned that Principle, have turned Ranters, and Atheists, as too many, 'tis to be feared, have: I hope the Principle is no more to be charged with it, than *Paedobaptism* is; for all the Blasphemies and Immoralities that persons of that Perswasion do much more frequently fall into without (or with so little) controle.

M. Wills Chargeth the Principle to be of a dividing Nature,

Having considered the *Invalidity* of the first Reason, Why the Principle is *naught*, viz. from the Wickedness of those that *Profess* it; we come in the next place to examine what he hath farther to say to that he calls the *disquieting*, dividing *Nature* of it, to prove it false and dangerous. Which we find *p.* 95. in these words, *viz. The very Principle of Anabaptistry is of a dangerous Nature, which in that Rigidity, as some men hold it, is of a disquieting tendency, that, as Mr.* Bunian *saith, is not fit for any age or state of the Church. I cannot but sigh to consider the ways of some men, whose spirits are impregnated therewith, so that their very Constitution inclines them to nothing more than to rent and tear, and divide the Church: The Zeal for their Opinion hath, and doth still prove the greatest hinderance to the Conjunction of Christians here in this Nation. For as soon as they become Baptists, as some call them, (and our Opposites love to appropriate the name to themselves) they fall off from Godly Ministers and People, differing from them, though never so holy. But let men calmly consider, whether this is not an effect of Ignorance, and Pride; and more from an erring, than well instructed Conscience: and what a Scandal and Shame it is to the Christian Religion to make it thus a fomenter of Faction, and Disturbance in the World? And what an Injury is hereby done to Christ, by contracting, and narrowing his Interest in such a manner? But I see not how it can be otherwise, if men adhere, and strictly keep themselves to the Antipædobaptistical Principle: for if*

any

our Ministers be no true Ministers, and our Baptism a Nullity; and consequently, our Churches no true Churches, how can they hold Communion with us? And though some that are for Baptism of Believers do, yet it must be imputed to their good Nature, and not their Principle, which they cross in so doing.

So that now you have him in words at length, and not in figures; as to which I desire the following things may be considered.

Firſt, that notwithſtanding what he hath ſaid as to the *Scandals* attending it to prove it *falſe*; he ſeems now to make the proof of all to lye in this, *that ſome Perſons holding the ſame refuſe Communion with Mr.* Wills; and therefore all ſuch as ſo *diſſent* from him, are to be expoſed to *ſcorn*, and *hatred*, as lying, *treacherous*, *diſobedient*, *perjured*, *ſeditious*, filthy Perſons; for holding a *falſe*, and dangerous *Principle*. Anſwered

Secondly, The *Principle of Anabaptiſtry it ſelf, as ſome Men hold it*; By his own demonſtration he here makes the *mode of holding*; and that by *ſome Men* only, and not the *Principle* to be *dangerous*: for if it were the *Principle* it ſelf, it would then be contrary to all *Principles*, whether *Natural*, *Moral*, or *Divine*; and to its *ſelf* alſo: for Principles always remain the ſame in their own *Nature*, and receive not any ſuch *impreſſion* from the various conceptions of Men, as to vary in themſelves.

If he had ſaid that the Principle does *not* juſtifie them that hold it moſt rigidly in an evil

Opinion, or *Practise*, his demonstration had been good: for I am so far from justifying the Errors of those that hold either that *Opinion*, or the Opinion that is *contrary* to it; that I fear, both Mr. *Wills*, and my self, have cause to *search*, and to try our own *ways*; and to be humbled, for walking contrary to that *Principle* which we both own concerning Baptism.

Thirdly, Mr. *Wills* says *it is the Constitution of some, impregnated with this Principle, to rend the Church. And let Men consider, whether this be not an effect of Ignorance and Pride.* Now then with Mr. *Wills*, it is neither the *Principle* it self, nor the manner of holding it; but *Ignorance* and *Pride*: so that if I understand his way of *arguing*, either *Ignorance* and *Pride*, are all one with the Principle of *Anabaptistry* as terms *convertible*, or else the cause of *unbrotherly* divisions, is not from the *Principle* of Anabaptistry, but from *Ignorance* and *Pride*.

Fourthly, if the Correspondence and *Communion which some Anabaptists have with Mr.* Wills, *be from their good Nature, and cross to their Principles* (as he declares it is) then it seems, that as *Ignorance* was before the ground of their *rending* from him, so here *Ignorance* is also the ground of their *Communion* with him; as not knowing that they therein cross their own *Principles*; nor that they are any way *obliged* to that *fellowship* by the Word of God, only their good *Nature* in-

inclines them not to break *Company*.

Fifthly, as to what he quotes from Mr. *Bunian*, it had surely been more *ingenuous*, either to have reply'd himself to those six *Arguments*, as yet *unanswered*, or provok'd Mr. *Bunian* to have done it before he had thus joined with him in his Anathama, for surely Reason is never *convincingly* answered by railing.

Sixthly, I see not the Reason why Mr *Wills*, or any other *Person*, should be thus severe against the Principles of *Baptism*, as proper only to *penitent* and *believing Persons*, (for if he mean any thing else by the *Principle* of *Anabaptistry* he fights with his own *shadow*, we being as much against *Rebaptisation*, as any that oppose it) for there is nothing in the Principle it self, but what *inclines* to *Piety* and *Unity*; it being designed by Christ, not only to promote *Sanctification*, Rom. 6. 4, 5, 6. *&c.* But to farther Love and Peace, as *Eph.* 4. 3, 4, 5. being the *incorporating* knitting *Ordinance*. Yet no Man that ever I have heard of, ever did, or can *pretend*, that this *Principle* perfects grace, and *knowledge*; and therefore now (as of old amongst the purest Churches) are *weaknesses*, *divisions*, errors, and evils, found *amongst us*; and so must it be *expected*, so long as an *evil heart* and *envious Devil* remains: yet withall do we own *subjection* to a *holy* and perfect *Rule* and *Directory*, to Correct and *Rectifie*, all errors and evil that may *arise*.

Ob.

Object. But if Baptism be esteemed a visible Enter into the *Visible Church*, and that you can own *Church Fellowship with none but Baptised Persons*, is not that a Dividing *Principle?*

Answ. It is true, it tends to divide betwixt World and Church, but not otherwise; and is no other than all that own the Christian Religion, whether *Papists, Protestants Presbyterian* and *Independents* acknowledge, Baptism being also owned by the *Antients* to be *Janua Sacramentorum*; and so positive is Mr. *Baxter* for it, that he tells us in expres terms, that they must deny the *Scripture* that deny it: his words are these in his place Scripture, p. 24. *I know not what in shew of Reason can be said to this by those that renounce not Scripture; for what man dare go in a way that hath neither Precept nor Example to warrant it, from one that hath a full current of both? Yet they that will admit Members into the Church without Baptism, do so.*

So that till Infants Sprinkling be proved Christs Ordinance of Baptism, *Pædobaptists* (by their own acknowledgment) are not to be esteemed *Visible* Members of the Church of Christ, having never had an orderly admission therein.

Object. But is not much *Injury* hereby offered to Christ, thus to contract and narrow his Interest in such a manner?

Answ. It is true, it is so said by Mr. *Wills*: But this is no other than *Reformation* in a age

Ages (*since the Antechristian Defection*) hath been *charged with*, and particularly that *Reformation* that has been endeavoured in that other *Ordinance* of the Lords Supper: Therefore do the *Presbyterians* cry out againſt the *Independants* for *ſinful Schiſm*, as being *Fomenters of Faction*, and for narrowing of Chriſts *Intereſt* in their reſpective *Seperations* and Church Communions: to the ſhame and ſcandol of the Chriſtian Religion: the ſame do the *Prelates* ſay to the *Presbyterians*, and the very ſame do the *Papiſts* ſay to the *Epiſcoparians* alſo. But Wiſdom is juſtified of her Children.

Thus have we acquit our Principle and Practice from Mr. *Wills* his Falſe, Unchriſtian, and Injurious Calumnies he has caſt upon us. And ſhall recommend it to the Readers conſideration, whether he hath not by this unreaſonable (not to ſay malicious) carriage towards us, witneſſed too much affinity, with that ſlanderous Libell, called *Baxter Baptized in Blood*: that was the firſt Anſwer to the Treatiſe of Baptiſm; and which by Publick Authority was Renounced, and declared ſcandalous malicions.

FINIS.

A brief friendly Reply to Mr. *Blindmans* friendly Answer about *Infants Baptism*, in his Essay tending to issue that Contraversie.

SIR,

AS to your Essay which came to my hands when I was busily engaged with Mr. Wills, *I have at last got so much* time *to say these few* things *to it*, Viz.

First, *As to the* Stile *and* Language, *I must needs acknowledge* (*if compared with* M. Wills) *to be Sober and Christian, though not without your severe Reflections.*

Secondly, *As to the* Substance *of what you write, I make this brief Reply.*

1. *So far as you have concerned your self in the* Historical *and* Ritual parts, *this to* Mr. W. *may be a* sufficient *Answer.*

2. *What you or* Mr. W. *say to the* Doctrinal *part*, Mr. Tombes *hath for this present saved me the* labour *by the return he makes to you both therein: though if God spare me Life, I intend to say something to you also hereafter.* But,

3. *To the main design of your Book*, viz. *The parity you make betwixt* Infants Baptism, *and* Womens Receiving the Lords Supper, *wherein you suppose you have gain'd so much advantage as to put an end to the Contraversie, I return as followeth:*

This confest I said indeed shew but as good Example *and* Command *for* Infant Baptism, *as we do for* Womens Receiving *the* Lords Supper, *and it shall suffice; Which, notwithstanding your great* confidence, *I see not in the least made* good, *but the contrary altogether; and, which I doubt not, is hereby manifest to you and all men.*

First therefore, as to the Example *urged by me, from* Act. 1. 14. *&* 2. 42. 44. *viz. That* Mary *the Mother of* Jesus, *and the Women, were of the number of the* 120 *Disciples, and who did break bread with the* 3000 *that were added to them.*

To which you give the following Exceptions.

First, That is it not expresly said, that the Women were Believers.

Neither in this place is Peter, *and the rest of the Apostles expresly so called, but they are called* Disciples, *and so are the Women, being of the number of the* 120, vers. 15. *And if any doubt, Whether Mary the Mother of* Jesus, Was a Believer, *It will by a good Evidence appear as that the Twelve were so; For, so testifyeth the* Angel, Luk. 1. 18. Elizabeth, *v.* 45. *and her own triumphant* Faith *v.* 46. to 56. *And that* the Women, *her Companions, were so also, there is little ground to doubt, when it is considered who they were, viz.* Mary Magdal. Mary the Wife of Cleophas, Joanna and Salom, *&c. Who came* with Christ *out of* Galilee, *and eminently* administred to him, followed *him to his* Cross, *to the* Sepulchre, annoyed *his Body,* witnessed *to his Resurrection, and to whom he gave Direction with the rest of his* Disciples *at his* Ascention, *to wait at* Jerusalem *for the promised* Spirit, Mat. 27. 55. *&c.* Mar. 16. 19. Luk. 23. 55. *to the* 11 of the 24. chap. John 19. 25.

Another Exception *is, That* There is no mention that these women were in the great Assembly in the second of the *Acts*: For, How do you know but they might be dead, or sick, or absent, as *Thomas* was before, *Job.* 20. 24. as nothing expresly to the contrary, so nothing expresly affirmed that they were present, *pag.* 3.

This

That is very strange; For is it not expresly said, (as one continued discourse) by Luke, chap 2. 1. *That they were all upon the day of* Penticost, with one accord in one place: *And who could these* All *be that were thus assembled, but the* 120 Disciples *before mentioned, who had been waiting together by Christs appointment for the promised Spirit, the space of ten dayes since the Ascension; and who were now to* Receive an Answer, *none therefore being to be* absent. *And that the Women were* present *among them upon the pouring out of the Spirit is manifest, because* Peter *thereupon affirms,* That the Prophesie of *Joel* was then fulfilled, that foretold the powring out of the *Spirit*, upon the *Daughters* and *Hand-maids*, as well as the *Sons*, Act. 2. 16, 17.

Another Exception *is this.* The words, you say, upon which you lay the stress of Womens receiving the Lords Supper here, are in express tearms against you, though you take them expressly for you, *&c.* it being expressly said, [*That all that believed were together.*] Let us now fairly exam *ne* the *Greek* phrase, and we shall find it expressly of *Men* and not of *Women*, *Viz.* οἱ πιστεύοντες, the Article *οἱ* being masculine, doth expressly limit it to Men and not to Women. As if he had said, All the Men that believed were together, and continued in the Apostles Doctrine, breaking of Bread, *&c.* And to confirme the same, you'l find the rest of the Chapter speakes expressly of, and to Men, *viz.* ἕκας *&c.* every man, *v.* 6, 8. Ἄνδρες, *&c.* Ye Men of *Jerusalem*, *vers.* 22. *&c.*

To which I say, That this Exception, *in my judgement, seemes to be as defective in* Grammer *as in* Divinity;

vinity; *For, as to the* Grammatical part, *you cannot but remember, Sir, That our* Lissys Grammer, *tells us of the Figure* Sylepsis, *or* Conceptio, That comprehends the less worthy under the more worthy, Indignioris, sub Digniore; *as for example.* Quid tu & soror facitis. Ego & Mater, miseri perimus. Tu & Uxor, qui adiuistis, testes estote. *Therefore why should you so forget your self, as to think it strange that the beliving Women should be comprehended under the believing Men. And as to the defect in* Divinity, *What is more frequent in* Scripture? *Do not you know it is told us,* Gen. 5. 2. Male and Female created he them, and called their name *Adam*, in the day when they were created. *But to some of your Instances, which I wonder to find urged by a Person of Gravity and Learning. First, as to the Article* ὁ, *which surely you cannot but know is so common to both sexes, (and not limited to the Masculine Gender, as always to understand thereby the Man only, as you say) For, it is not said,* Mark 16. 16. ὁ πιστεύσας, *that* beliveth, and is baptized, *is not the* She *fully comprehended therein also? And,* 1 Cor. 7. 30. οἱ κλαίοντες, They that weep; οἱ χαίροντες, They that rejoyce; οἱ ἀγοράζοντες, They that buy; οἱ χρώμενοι, They that use this World; *Doth the Article in all these (and a 100 places more of the Nature that might be produced) so limit it to the Masculine Gender, that only men and not women are to be understood, I hope you will not say so. And it is not said,* 1 Cor. 6. 16. οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν, They two shall be one flesh; *the Article doth equally respect both. But so much for the Article* οἱ.

Secondly, The Word ἕκαστος, *it comprehends both* sexes,

sexes, *and not the* Masculine *only*, *as* 1 Cor. 7. 20. Let every Man, [ἐκάστῳ] abide in the same calling wherein he is called. *And* Jam. 1. 14. Every Man, [ἕκαστος,] is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed, *surely must comprehend* every Woman to, *or else it would be* strange Divinity.

Thirdly, The Word ἀνθρώπος, *the very same, as* Jam. 1. 2. For if there come into your Assembly a Man, [ἀνὴρ,] having a gold Ring, &c. *Is not a* Woman *to be understood also thereby?* *And* Jam. 1. 8. *A* double minded Man, [ἀνὴρ,] is unstable in all his ways: *And is not a* double minded Woman *so also? We might trouble the* Reader *with the rest of your* Instances *of this kind, but let these satisfie.*

So that Sir, you see your Exceptions *to my* Examples, *are* utterly insignificant, *for here were* Women Disciples *and* Believers, *in* Praying together *for the* Spirit, *and afterwards* receiving the same together, *also* continuing together *in the* Apostles Doctrine, Fellowship, *and* Breaking of Bread, *and* Prayer; *neither can your pretended* limitation *of* Masculine Words *and* Articles, *you see*, relieve you, *or* invalidate *our* Authority. *And in* confirmation *thereof we may add*, *Act.* 20. 7. That the Disciples came together to break bread, Women *being as much* Disciples *as* Men. *Act.* 9. 36. *And it is also said*, 1 Cor. 11. 18, 20. That the Church came together to break bread, *Women being* Church-members *as well as* Men. *Act.* 8. 12. *though debarred some* Priviledges *as* 1 Cor. 14. 34. 1 Tim. 2. 11, 12, 13. For there is neither male nor female, but all one in Christ, *Gal.* 3. 28. *And*, being many, are one Bread and one Body; Believing Women *being as much of the* Body

of

of Christ as believing men, 1 Cor. 10. 17. *And we are enjoyed to keep* Christs Precepts *and* Commandments, *left in charge for* all Disciples *as well as the Men*, Mat. 28. 20. *This of* Breaking of Bread after Baptism, *being none of the* least *of them*; *And* who must give account *for* disobedience *and* neglect *of* duty *as well as the Men*.

And as your own Conscience seals to the truth hereof, so you are forced also to declare it, telling us, How unpleasing it is to you, to raise Arguments against a known Truth, being, *as you say*, as much for Believing Womens receiving the Lords Supper as the men.

Thus have you my Proofs *for* Womens receiving the Lords Supper, *and the* Verity *thereof* continued by your self: *Therefore in the next place we shall try whether you have*, as clear, *or*, *as you say*, more full proof *for the* Example *of* Infants Baptism, *and as to which, you gave the following* Instances. *Viz.*

First, That *Lydia* was Baptized and her Household, *Acts* 16. 19. It is not said that any of her House were Converted besides her self.

Secondly, The Houshold of *Stephanus*, 1 *Cor.* 1. 16. it being apparent, that House in Scripture, doth comprehend Children, 1 *Sam.* 26. 15. 2 *Sam.* 9. 1. *Exod.* 1. 21. *&c. Therefore you say*, Let impartial persons judge, whether this doth not carry as much, if not more probability and evidence in it, than what hath been brought for Womens receiving the Lords Supper, and not lyable to such Exceptions from the Context, not from any other Scripture. *Wherein I joyne issue with you in the Appeal, beseeching you and all men to consider.*

First, *Whether there be one* Infant *so much as* nea-

mention be in either of these Households, much less that any were Baptized in them.

That we have Women expressly mentioned to be of the number of the 120 Disciples, upon whom also the Spirit was poured in the day of Penticost, to whom the 3000 were joyned, and who together broke bread also.

Secondly, Are Children as expressly owned to have right to Baptisme, and enjoyned thereto, and capable to discern the spiritual Mysteries thereof, and to act Faith therein, being Believers, part of the Church, and Members of the Body of Christ, as Women are expressly owned to have right to the Ordinance of the Supper? and enjoyned thereto, and capable to discern the spiritual Mysteries thereof, and to act Faith therein, as being Believers, part of the Church, and Members of the Body of Christ?

Thirdly, Is Infants Baptism acknowledged by us to be a known Truth, and that it is unpleasant to us to raise Arguments against it, as you have in express terms done for Womens receiving the Lords Supper?

So that here is not the least parity, or comparison, to be made betwixt the one or the other, there being not the least considerable pretence to imagine that any Infants were Baptized, because 'tis said that Households were.

First, Because, though it is true that Infants may belong to the Household, so may the heathen Idolaters Wife, and Servants, and that Children are said to be in some Households, yet there are many Households wherein there are no Children, and it is not proved that there was any Infant belonging to either of these two Households.

Secondly

Secondly, *In the four* Households *mentioned to be* Baptized *in Scripture, they are said, at least in three of them, if not in the fourth also, to comprehend only such as were* taught Believers; *in those* Families or Households.

As, 1st. *Concerning the* Jaylor, *Act.* 16. 32, 33, 34. *It is said*, They spake the Word to all that were in his House, and that He, *viz. the Jaylor*, Believed in God, with all his House.

2ly, *Crispus*, *Act.* 18. 8. *And Crispus* believed on the Lord, and all his House.

3ly, Stephanus House, *that was Baptized*, 1 Cor. 1. 16. *are called*, the first-fruits or *Achaia*, that addicted themselves to the *Ministery* of the Saints, *which no* Infant *was capable to do.*

And the 4th, *is the* Household *of* Lydia, *where we have good ground to conclude, there were none* Baptized *in it but* Believers. *First because there was no Precept to Baptize* any other. *Secondly, No Example for* any other. *And thirdly, From what is said of them, Act.* 16. 40. *They were* only *Adult persons capable of* Instruction *and* Consolation, *for we said*, Paul and Sylas, after they came out of Prison, entered into the House of Lydia, and comforted the Brethren there, *viz. those in that Family that had been troubled for the hard usuage and Imprisonment of the Apostles.*

Besides, tis very probable Lydia *was a single Person, no Husband being mentioned, but she in chief all along. But surely, it is on their part, that say she had* Children, *and* baptized Children *too, to prove it; For as yet it doth not appear, but the contrary. So that there is neither* Child *expressly, nor by any consequence to be found in any of these* Baptized Households.

In so much that Dr. Hamond, *that last great Writer for* Infants Baptism *confesseth, in his sixth* Quæry, *pag.* 471, That to conclude *Infants* were *Baptized*, because *Households* are so mentioned to be, is unconvincing and without Demonstration, it being so uncertain whether there was any *Children* in those *Families. As though, If the Master of the* Family Bewed, *all the* House, *whether* ignorant, unconverted, Sophane, and Athiestical, *were to be* Baptized *also.*

In the next place we come to examine the parity *twixt the* Command *we urge for* Womens receiving the Lords Supper, *and that which is pretended by us for* Infants *Baptism.*

The Command *we bring for* Womens receiving the Lords Supper, *is* 1 *Cor.* 11. 28. Let a man Examine himself, and so let him eat, *&c. Viz.* Man *or* Woman, *for so the Word* ἄνθρωπος, *in the* Greek, *and* Adam, *in the* Hebrew *signifie.* There being one Mediator betwixt God and Man, *and* Woman; the Man Christ Jesus, 1 *Tim.* 2. 45. *Being* both *but* one in Christ, *Gal.* 3. 28.

To which you thus Reply, You gather it from the Greek Word ἄνθρωπος, which is of the Masculine and Femenine Gender, and so signifies *Male* and Female, which I deny not: But I must crave leave to inform you, That when it is limited with words of the *Masculine* Gender, it hath reference expresly to *Men* and not to *Women*; and that it is so here, you say, you shall abundantly prove, because it is limited; (*where* you bring ἕκαστος again, *and some others of like import mentioned in the Chapter.*

Secondly, From the Text it self, where the Relative, ἑαυτὸν, is joyned to ἄνθρωπος, and so it is

expressly limited to the *Masculine*, and therefore to a *Man* only, and not to a *Woman*. Therefore the Text must be read, Let a *Man* Examine himself (*expressly, not a Woman*) and so let him eat, &c.

But I appeal to the sober and judicious Reader, whether *this* is not a meer trifling *in the* things of God, and a playing with Words, *to* pervert the Truth?

As for the Word ἐαυτὸν, *and others of like nature, we need say no more, and to the* Relative ἑαυτὸν, *a little; Mr.* Blindman *knowing, I verily believe there is little but deceit in it. For, what more frequent in Scripture, than to find this* Relative *to respect both sexes? For Instance,* Jam. 1. 23, 24. If any be a hearer of the Word, and not a doer, he is like unto a man beholding his natural Face in a Glass. For he beholdeth himself, and goeth his way, &c. *which, I presume, takes in the Woman as well as the Man.* Rom. 13. 9. Love thy Neighbour as thy self, *the same. So Matth.* 28. 19, 20. Baptizing *them*, and Teaching *them*, *the same also. So that by Mr.* Blindmans *rule, we have as little express* Command *for their* Baptism *as their* Communion, *and that Men are only concerned in both: So that your* Exceptions *to our* Command, *are as insignificant as those to our* Example.

Then you come, Sir, to produce your Command *for* Infants Baptism, *which you would make us believe is as clear, if not clearer that what hath been given for* Womens receiving the Lords Supper, *viz. Mat.* 28. 19. Go teach, or *Discipulize*, all Nations, baptizing them, *and that* Children *are* Disciples, *is clear you say, from Act.* 15. 10. Why tempt you God, to put a Yoak upon the neck of the *Disciples?*

But

But for your better Information in Christs Commission, *I must refer you to the account Mr. Baxter gives of it, who tells us the right Order thereof, and Lessons therein,* Viz. That the first task is to *make Disciples, which, he tells us,* by *Mark* are called *Believers.* The second is *Baptize them.* And the third *to Teach them* all other things which are afterwards to be learned in Christs Schoole; *Which is a right and true definition of the Text: The Word,* μαθητευσατε, *to* Discipulize *or make* Disciples, *is nothing else but to beget them to the* Faith, *by* preaching *the* Gospel *to them, the true means thereof, and then being* instructed *in the* Faith, *they are to be* Baptized *therein. And therefore again, Mr.* Baxter *truly tells us,* That it is the constant Order, that *Baptism* follow *Faith,* and no better than an *Impious profanation* of the *Sacrament* if it go without *Faith*; And that if *Faith* be not the *Pre-requisite* to *Baptism Philip* deluded and not decided the Question, when he told the *Eunuch, If he Believed with all his heart,* he might. *So that when you can make it appear your* Infant, *as a* taught Disciple, believes in Christ, *you may find a* Command *here to* Baptize him. *Otherwise, as Mr.* Baxter *tells us,* Philips *answer carries a* Negative *in it,* viz. *If thou dost not believe, thou mayst not be* baptized.

And as for Infants Discipleship, *from Act. 15. 10. It is an utter mistake, the* Disciples *there being those* Gentile Believers *that had newly received the* Faith, *who were neither to be* yoked *with* Circumcision, *nor any other* Jewish Rite, *only they were* injoyned *to abstain from* Idolathits, Blood, things Strangled *and* Fornication, *there being no* Infant

in the Case, nor concerned herein, neither are they any where called Believers or Disciples.

Therefore, Sir, upon the whole, Let the Judicious Reader judge betwixt us, whether you have given as good Ground, by as full Precept or Example for Baptizing Infants, as I have done from Gods Word for Womens Receiving the Lords Supper? No doubting but this search into this your Essay, will put a comfortable End to this part of the Controversie betwixt us.

In the next place you must give me leave to return you an Answer to three or four smart Reflections I meet with in your Book.

First, Sir, I conceive you have given me just occasion of Offence, so unduly to mention my not taking notice of Mr. Baxters Errata, without any the least regard to what I have so largely spoke for his Satisfaction, and my own Vindication, (having received the like measure from Mr. Wills therein also.) And whether the reproving that my Omission with such severity, and wholly passing over those Horrible false Remarks by me (without Controle, as yet) on Mr. Bs. Directroy, savours not of too much Partiality, is recommended to your better consideration.

Secondly, No less injurious are you, and Mr. W. also, from the consideration of those Waldensian Confessions of Faith, where they assert Infants Baptism, to infer my mistaking of them in the whole, and to foyl all my other Testimonies in the Book; without taking the least notice how I cited the late Confession word for word, proving, they were not till their Defection in the sixteenth Century, and that then the Confessions, viz. by me, were in the twelveth Cen.

400 years before; nor regarding what I Answer to every one of them, to which I must refer you, and to what I say to Mr. Wills for the like Disingenuity.

Thirdly, Sir, I have to blame you for a piece of unfairness, not to say unfaithfulness, respecting the Ritual part, where, to avoid the force of the Word Tabal, which the Septuagint renders by the Greek Word Βαπτίζω, and all our Translators by the word Dip. You produce a Text, pag. 190, wherein (as you deal with it) you would necessitate another Interpretation to be put upon it, viz. Levit. 14. 6. As for the living Bird, he shall take it and the Cedar-wood, and the Scarlet, and the Hyssop, and shall Dip them and the living in the blood of the Bird that was kill'd [there you stop, and leave out] over the running Water; not taking any notice of what follows, vers. 51. And Dip them in the Blood of the slain Bird, and the running Water; But go on with your Inference, as though the running Water was not to be concerned in the Case, and say, Is it credible that the Bird that was killed did yeild so much blood that all those things could be Dipped under it, and Covered with it? Certainly (say you) you must, at least, run a Synechdoche here, or else you will make nothing of it. And if you do, and say a part of them only was Dipt, Why will you not at least allow the same in Baptism?

But whether such dealing with Gods Word comes not under a handling the Law partially, and dealing unfairly, not to say, deceitfully with it, is left to your own Conscience to determine.

Fourthly, I must endeavour to vindicate my self in another unhansom Reflection, respecting an absurdity

dity you charge upon me, and which I conceive will return upon your self and Partner too with disadvantage, which is this. You are pleased Sir, in pag. 117. to tell me, in answer to the beginning of my sixth Chapter, That you must crave leave to tell me, that I miss it in my Logick, in affirming the Right Subject of Baptism (*viz. a professed Believer*) to belong to the Matter and Essence of Baptism, *and which Mr. Wills* (*in conjunction with you*) carryes a little further, *and tells me, in his usual Stile,* pag. 90. part 2. chap. 6. It is observable, that he who hath undertaken to write a Treatise of Baptism (*Mark well,* saith he) should mistake both the Matter and Form of it; for certainly he is out in both (*and to be sure Mr. W. will lose nothing for want of Confidence, if they will carry it*). For the Matter, saith he, all Divines agree to be *Water*, and the Form, the *Words* of *Christ*. For which he quotes *Zanchy* and *Buchan*.

To which I say, as to the point of Logick (wherein I own little skill) in affirming, *The Subject belongs to the Matter and Essence of Baptism, and that the true Form was Dipping, I conceive I am satisfied by the Learned. And as to the first, If Burgersdicius understood Logick, he tells us,* That the Subject doth belong to the Matter, and is of the *Essence* thereof; *Who divides the Matter into the Materia ex qua, in qua, & circa quam; of which, in which and about which*: and that the two latter comprehend the *Subject* or *Object*.

And agreeable hereto we have the Learned Tilenus *giving us the* Logical *Definition of Baptism, both as to Matter and Form, in his* Syntag. Theol. Dis-

de

de Baptif. pag. 376. *in these words. First*, That the *Matter* of *Baptism* is two fold, *viz.* the *Constituens* and *Recipiens*; the *Constituens* of two parts, *viz. External* and *Elementary*, viz. the *Water*. *And* Internal, the Spiritual thing signified. *And the Recipiens, Materiæ*, or Subject, *is the* fit Person *that is to receive it. Secondly*, That the *Essential Form* of *Baptism* is nothing else but the *Analogical* Reason of the *Signes* to the *Things signified*. For as the property of Water in washing away the filth of the Flesh, declares the force of Christs *Blood* in the washing away of Sin, So *Diping* in *Water* is a suitable *Analogy* of the *Death* of the *Old Man*; and coming up out of the *Water*, the *Life* of the *New*.

And in full agreement with him, the Learned Sir Norton Knatchbull *in his* Animad. pag. 317. *tells us from Alexander* Halyes, *in these words*, Aio cum *Alex.* de *Halys*, Tinctio est *formalis Causa Baptismi*, & si Tinctio, non Lotio, vel lavatio, vel ablutio; I say with *Alexander* de *Halys*, That *Dipping* is the *formal Cause* of *Baptism*; and if *Diping*, then not *washing* or *pouring*.

So that if these Learned Men are Right, *you, my Reprovers, are* Wrong, *and deserve blame and shame for your* Rashness.

And further, that the right Subject, *viz. a profest Believer is of the Essence of* Baptism *is manifest because, if you may alter and change that, you may* Baptize *a* Wall, *or a* Bell, *a* Sword, *or a* Standard, *or what you will, and call it the* Ordinance *of* Baptism. *So that I am hereby the more confirmed, that if you miss it in the* Right Subject, *or* Matter *of* Baptism, *viz.*

not a Profest Believer, and err also in the due Form or Ceremony, viz. Dipping, you have neither the Matter nor the Form of Baptism; and so, though you may call it Baptism, yet it is a meer Nullity, and no such thing; concerning which, I refer you to the Scheam thereof, in the Broad-side, for further Information, and so shall Conclude with your own Words. If these Debates may be blest to discover the Truth to your self, or any other, and add any thing to the making up of the Breach, that the Lord may be one, and his Name one amongst us, in these points where in we yet differ; I shall have what I aimed at, and the God of Truth and Peace, shall have all the Glory. And that the Spirit of Light and Truth may lead into all Truth, and dispel all the Antichristian Fogs of Ignorance and Darkness, is the Sincere Desire of

Your Unknown Friend

The 30th. of the 8th. Monethy, 1674.

and Servant. H. D.

The Reader is desired to Correct these Escapes in this *Brief Reply*. Viz. Page 178. line 7. r. *is it not*. f. *is it not*. p. 180. l. 20. f. *is it not*, f. *is it not*. p. 183. l. 29. r. *Idolatrous* f. *Idolaters*. p. 184. l. 13. r. *of* f. *or*.

FINIS.

[illegible]CENCY [illegible] TR[illegible]
[illegible]INDICATED;

OR,

A Sober REPLY to Mr *WILL*[illegible]
ANSWER to a Late TREATISE
of BAPTISME.

Wherein the Authorities and Antiquities
[illegible] Believers, and against *Infants Baptism*,
are Defended, and the mis-representations
and Forgeries he boasts of, all returned
upon himself.

With a brief Answer to Mr *Blinman's* Essay.

By *Henry Danvers*.

Ut ex lapidum attritu ignis elicitur, sic sæpe [illegible] alternationes imo & altercationum sermonum [illegible] Lipsius.

Prov. 18. 17. *He that is first in his own Cause, [illegible] just, but his Neighbour cometh and [illegible] him.*

[illegible] for *Francis Smith*, at the Elephant and [illegible] the Royal Exchange in Cornhill, [illegible]

THE PREFACE

one of those many Authorities in the Historical part, and [illegible] Bellius; not another that is considerable in the whole Book.

Therefore all that I have to ask of the Candid Reader (as whose Barr the matter is now brought betwixt Mr. Will's and me) is only to do themselves and the truth in Question so much right as to afford the Common Justice of [illegible] that having heard the Recrimination, they will also attend to what is said herein for vindication.

Wherein you have his Arguments duely weighed, and refuted, his caviling exceptions answered, his pretended forgeries, and falshoods, disproved; the Antiquities of Believers Baptisme defended, the innovation, groundless Tradition, and novelty of Infants Baptisme confirmed. The witness against it by eminent men and famous Churches for many Ages maintained; his injurious Calumnyes and reproaches (that he not only designes to load the Professors of believers Baptisme with, but the Profession it self also) detected and reproved, The groundless custome of sprinkling instead of Dipping further evinced.

As for his undue and uncomly reflections, the haughty, bitter wrathfull, frothy and provoking spirit, he appears in through the whole Book, so unbecoming Christian candor, his holy Profession, or the nature of the ordinance treated of, I shall the least concern my self about, but leave it to him that can convince and will certainly reckon for such hard speeches for his names sake; and rather so farr as concerns my self with Job to bind it about me for a Crown, Job. 31. 36. And as exhorted Mat. 5. To rejoyce to be accounted worthy to suffer contempt & reproach for the truth sake, &c. then to render Railing for Railing. It being also ever judged the signe of a bad cause, for persons to betake themselves to such courses, and thereby to supply the want of [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] with, and that for these following reasons.

First, because the historical part upon which [illegible] stress hath been laid (though [illegible] part of the controversy) was the principal [illegible] added by me (to bring [illegible] Mr. Wall's observations) next to an impossibility [illegible] any new Scripture, or almost any new [illegible] born [illegible] to urge in the controversy [illegible] and is [illegible] therefore by him opposed.

Secondly, Because he has ingeniously confessed, that there is no express Scripture for the same; and so many of themselves with one Mouth have owned, the necessity of express Scripture to warrant and justify the practise of every part of Gods worship, and that to practise any thing in the worship of God without express warrant from the Word, is superstition and false worship, [illegible] such a Principle ought to be held fast, as the great Protestant Bulwark to secure us against all Popish [illegible] ons and Traditions; and which is a sufficient [illegible] their own Mouths against any thing they [illegible] tended inferences and farr-fetch't Consequences [illegible] all that can possibly be said for it.

Thirdly, because M. Tombs hath now given a particular Answer to him and Mr. Blinman therein, [illegible] the [illegible] Anabaptists that Mr. W. R. expressed [illegible] [illegible]

And, Ly. because [illegible] [illegible]

Arguments usually brought by Pædobaptists *are not good in themselves.* p. 52.

Fourthly, Fearful ositanacy or heedlesness, repeating my words truly in one place, and yet afterwards Fathering the quite contrary upon me; as p. 32.

Fifthly, Notoriously partial in his Answers all the Book through, replying to some things he judges weak, and leaving others unanswered, and yet vaunting over the whole: as for instance, in the 4. Cent. I give the sayings of 10 Fathers for adult Baptisme, *he replys only to 4. of them, saith not a word to the rest, and yet concludes against them all, as p. 6. &c. So in like manner as to the 10. Instances given from the most eminent men not baptized till aged, though the children of Christian Parents, replys only to 4. and not a word to the other 6. and yet concludes against them all, as though he had particularly answered to them, as p. 11. to 15. (though his reply as you'l finde, is as insignificant in both as his silence.) And further I produce 3. Councils in the 4. Cent. for the same, to which he weakly replyes,* he can produce 3 times ten Councells for Infants Baptism, *viz. in after centuryes when by Popish Councells it was injoind and imposed, as p. 10. And again I quote* Spanhæmius *and* Osiander *to prove a thing, he takes notice only of* Spanhæmius *that speaks to part, but not to* Osiander *that speaks to the whole; and yet, reproves me for my mistake as p. 148. &c.*

And further he allows out two witnesses for Beleevers Baptism *only,* viz. Boemus *and* Srabo, *and yet leaves multitudes of them unexcepted against; & unreplyd to, as p. 2. &c. In like manner excepts against but 6. of above 40. particular witnesses against* Infants Baptisme, *and yet allows but 1.* viz. Hincmarus *and* Adrianus, *as p. 104. 105. And again, I quote eleven several Churches denying* Infants Baptism, *he excepts only against 3 saith nothing to all the rest, yet owns none of them. p. 17.*

Sixthly,

Sixthly, the inveteracy of spirit testified all along [illegible] against the professors and profession itself of [illegible] tism only, especially in his railing and false accusations, from p. 145. to 171.

As for my Epitomizing *and repeating some of* Mr Tombes's *Arguments, and not always mentioning his name, which he calls* Plaigiarisme, *I do confess in that my collection, I have not so punctually mentioned all the [illegible] ty from Book to book, wherein (except in the Historical part) I do little more then bring to remembrance, in a new Method (for the benefit of the present age) what has heretofore in large Treatises been writ upon this subject, which I think it usual in Polemical writings, or if I [illegible] not, Mr* Sydnham *doth the same thing without mentioning of names, from whom the arguments are brought (which may be endless;) And if I have been thereby injurious to any I beg their pardon; I am sure I have not been so to the truth; But herein I conceive Mr* Will's *hath not [illegible] ly, if to reprove me for the same thing he doth himself, for I could draw paralells too upon him if I would be [illegible] and impertinent; and 2ly to avoid answering the [illegible] of the Arguments, upon pretence they are another [illegible] which I conceive favours little of ingenuity and [illegible] for current pay.*

It is true, it must be owned that Mr Tombes *[illegible] soever slighted by* M. Will's *(though in some things [illegible] different from most that own this way) hath done very [illegible] this controversy, & was an eminent instrument that God raised up among it the learned to plead and defend that despised truth, & whose learned labours and unanswered Books do witness for him in the gate, though* M. Will's *is pleased so ignorantly to vaunt it, & tell us in his Epistle that the Arguments for* believers against *Infants Baptisme* are a parcel of Trite

over-

THE WITNESSES FOR Believers Baptisme Freed from Forgery and Prevarication.

CHAP. I.

The Baptisme of Believers, *with the* Authorities *urged for the necessity of* Confession *of Faith before it; is* defended *and the Quotations out of the* Magdeburg's, *vindicated from Mr.* Wills's *charge of* Prevarication *and* Falshood.

THe *Method* I shall observe herein, shall be to give you a briefe account of the *Antiquities*, and *Authorities* brought by me, to prove the necessity of *Faith* before *Baptisme*; and then his *Exception* against them, and my *Reply* thereto: whereby the Reader may be able to make an *easie*, and *speedy* judgement, at whose door the *Prevarications* and Falshoods lye.

Having, as you'l find, in the 6. first Chapters by 6. Arguments from positve scripture proved: That Believers upon Profession of Faith,

are the only Subjects of Baptisme, did in my 7. Chapter (by way of *Illustration* only) confirm the same, from the eminent *Testimony* that had been born thereto, throughout all ages. Firmly witnessing, That Confession and Profession of Faith, with free choice, was necessary before Baptisme; And which evidence, as I have given it you, through all the Centuries, you may gather up under 2. Heads: First, *What hath been said thereto by the Ancients themselves, in the first four Centuries, before Infants Baptisme was enjoyn'd.* (and how confirm'd by our moderne Writers); And secondly, *what witness of that kind hath been born thereto, after Infants Baptisme was imposed, as well by those that deny'd Infants Baptisme, as those that own'd, and practised it, not only of the Romish* Church, *but others through all the rest of the Centuries.*

All the Authorities under 2. Heads.

To which *Testimonies* Mr. *Wills* makes his *Exceptions*, charging me with *Prevarication*, in relating somethings *partially*, others *falsly*, and for the most part contrary to the *intention* of the Writers; and to that degree, that except only two: *viz. Boemus* and *Strabo*. That I have *perverted* the sayings of *all the Authors* throughout the *Centuries*.

Mr. Wills charge for Prevarication and Falshood.

But how he makes this *charge* appear, is now to be the *Question*. And therefore in order to the due *Examination* thereof, we shall join *issue* with him, and put it to the tryall, how and in what particulars he will make good either the *Prevarications*, or *falsehoods*, suggested by him.

First,

First as to the *Prevarications*.

The *Prevarications* he mentions, must appear either in the *Authorities* produced *before*, or *since* Infants *Baptisme* was enjoyn'd. 1. Prevarications.

First, as to those produced by me, *before* Infants Baptisme was imposed: *viz.* from the *four first Centuries*. It is manifest, that as to all the *Testimonies* I bring in the three first *Centuries*, so *positively* affirming, that Profession of *Faith* was to *precede* Baptisme: He gives no materiall Exception, only saith this of *Tertullian*, pag. 6. second part: *That the* Magdeburgs *tell us truely*, *that* Tertullian *in this age*, *opposed himself to some that Asserted Infants Baptisme*, *affirming that the Adult were the only proper Subjects. But how weakly he doth it*, *may be seen afterwards*, *when we come to examine the witnesses*, *of which* Tertullian *is the Van.*

So that I hope, it will be acknowledged, that here is no *Prevarication*, or perverting *evidence*, in these my first *Testimonies* in the three first *Centuries*; and where you will find there is more then seven times two, *Beemus* and *Strabo* being none of their number, so that if we should go no *further*, my first *Proposition* stands firme, that *Believers Baptisme* was the only *Baptisme* for near 300. years. None in the 3. first Cent.

But to proceed, I perceive his great cry against me, is for the *Authorities* I produce out of the *fourth Century*, but how justly, will speedily appear.

I do indeed say, that it is manifest to me,

That Adult Baptisme only practised in the 4. Cent. appears.

from the *Evidence* the *Magdeburg's* give us herein: That it was the approved and universall practice of this Age, as well in the *Eastern*, as *Western Churches*, to Baptise upon *Profession* of Faith.

And which is made good by a threefold *evidence*. First, from the sayings of the *Fathers*, and greatest men of this Century, both in *Africa*, *Asia*, and *Europa*.

Secondly, from the *positive* Decrees of three Eminent *Councells* in this Age.

Thirdly, from the pregnant instances of ten of the most *eminent Men*, that were not *Baptised* till aged, though the Children of Christian Parents, in this Century.

1. From the sayings of the Fathers.

2. Decrees of Councels.

3. From the Children of Christians not Baptised till aged.

First, from the *sayings* of the *Fathers*, both in the *East* and *West*.

Affrica.

First, that it doth not appear, that any other then *Adult Baptisme* was practised in the *Churches* of *Africa*, is manifest by the sayings of *Athanasius*, and *Arnobius*, two of the most eminent in those Parts, in this Age: Who do positively affirm, as appears by their saying, at large p. 55, 56. *That Teaching, Faith, and Desire should, according to Christ's Commission, precede Baptisme.* And to which we may add, what we have from *Optatus Milevitanus* an other Person of great Name in this Church, in this Age; who tell us in his 4. Book, as say the *Magdeburg's*, Century 4. p. 6. 237. *That none denyes; but that every Man by nature, though born of Christian Parents, is unclean, and that without the Spirit he is not cleansed, and that there is a necessity of the Spirits cleansing before*

1. Athanasius.

2. Arnobius.

3. Optatus Milev.

sure Baptisme? So that the house must be trim'd, and fitted for the Lord (viz. as he saith, the Soul of the Believer is) that God may enter and dwell in it; according to the saying of the Apostle: You are the Temple of God, and he dwells in you.

Secondly, that is was the Faith, and Practice of the Churches of *Asia*, appears by the like sayings, of *Basil*, *Greg. Nazianzen*, *Ephrim*, *Syrus*, *Epiphanius*, *&c.* as at large you have them p. 55, 56, 57. Asia.

Thirdly, that it was the universal practice in the *Western*, or *European* Churches, appears also from what is witnessed hereto, by *Hilary*, *Ambrose*, *Jerom*, and *Marius Victorinus*, in the foresaid Pages. And therefore do the *Magdeburg's*, upon *Hilary's* testimony, say, that the *Western Churches* did so observe it. And from *Jerom's* testimony, do also tell us, that it doth appear till his time, that the *Western Churches* did so continue, to Baptise the *Adult* upon Profession. (The Reader being desir'd, in both those Testimonies p. 55, 56. to put *Western* for *Eastern*. Europ.

Secondly, the truth of this further, appears from those Decrees of the three *Councels*; *viz.* The *Carthaginian* Councel in *Africa*; And the *Laodicean*, and *Neocesarean* Councels, in *Asia*, so positively *decreeing*: *That Teaching*, *Confession*, *Faith*, *and free Choice*, *ought to precede Baptisme*, which you have in pag. 80. 2. Three Councels.

Thirdly, a third Argument, that *Adult* Baptisme was the only *approved* Baptisme of this Age, I *demonstrated* from those ten *Remarkable* Instances, of the most *eminent* men in this Century; 3. Children of Christians not Baptised.

that were not Baptised, though the Children of Christian Parents, till they were *able* to make *Profession* of their *Faith*, *viz. Constantin*, *Bazil*, *Greg. Nazienzen*, *Ambrose*, *Chrysostom*, *Jerom*, *Augustin*, *Nectarius*, *Valentinian*, and *Theodosius*.

Four of the 10 excepted against.

To the first ten *Testimonies*, of the sayings of the Fathers, Mr. *Wills* except only against four, *viz. Athanasius*, *Basil*, *Ambrose*, and *Nazienzen*, because he saith, they are all of them express for *Infants Baptisme*; and which are therefore perverted by me, because I bring them for *Believers* Baptisme *only*, who were for Infants Baptisme also.

To which I say, that if but four of the ten be excepted against, then we have six more stand good for us, besides the former (*viz.* 15. not excepted against) as perverted. But

The four Wit. vindicated. *Viz.* Basil. Athan. Naz. Ambrose.

Secondly, it cannot be *denied*, but these four are very full in their Testimonies, for Adult Baptisme; only for *Basile* saith expresly, *Faith must needs precede, and that none else were to be Baptised, and what can be more full.* *Athanasius* as express also as he, *for Teaching, and Faith from Christs Commission before Baptisme.* And *Nazianzen* as positive as either, *That they neither Baptised any of Old without Profession, and that it was dangerous then so to do, and therefore advised, that Infants Baptisme should be deferred, till they were capable to make some Confession.* And *Ambrose* as full also, That the *Baptised should not only make Confession, but desire the same.* Therefore if any of them should contrary hereto say, Infants should be Baptised, it would not only contradict the *acknowledged Rule*, the general *confessed practice* of the Age, but *them-*

selves

selves also in the aforesaid *Testimony* born by them.

But thirdly, neither doth it appear upon a due search, for ought I can yet find, that these four did so contradict themselves, in asserting Infants Baptisme, as affirmed. For

First, *Athanasius* is much injured in Fathering those Questions to *Antiochus* upon him, in the 114. and 124. whereof Infants Baptisme is asserted, it being a *forged*, and *spurious thing*, and none of his, as I shall make manifest presently by *undeniable* proof. Athan. not for Infants Baptisme.

Secondly, neither will it appear, that *Basil.* has any where asserted *Infants Baptisme*, as I shall fully *demonstrate* in it's place also, and Mr. *Wills* his egregious mistake about it. Nor Basil.

Thirdly, As for the *Testimony* that he produceth, that *Ambrose* was for Infants Baptisme, from that saying of his, lib. 2. de Ab. cap. 11. *Because every age is obnoxious to sin, therefore every age fit to be for the Sacrament*, is no proof for the same; 1. Because Circumcision is there only meant. 2. If Baptised, then those of every age, that are fit for that Sacrament, must be supposed (as he before tells us) *viz.* those only *that are capable to confess Faith and desire Baptisme*; otherwise (by this testimony as he would carry it) not only all *Children*, but all *Men*, and *Women* in the World, the *Bad* as well as the *Good*, the *Unbelievers* as well as the *Believer*, being all obnoxious to sin, are therefore esteemed the fit *subjects* of Baptisme. But suppose *Ambrose* was positive for Infants Baptisme, it is but the opinion of one Doctor, that contradicts himself too, and that Nor Ambrose.

against the judgement, and practise of the Age.

Fourthly, As for the testimony he urges from *Greg. Nazienzen*, which has the most in it, we shall duely *Examine*; He tells us pag. 11. that *Greg. Nazienzens* words are expres in the case, and makes manifest that he was *absolutely* for *Infants Baptisme*, in his 40. Oration, *viz. Hast thou a young Child let it be early consecrated. yea even from its Infancy* (as Mr. *Wills* renders the word) *and therefore as in his* 3. *Oration they Baptised all ages, as he said.*

Nazian. not absolutely for Infants Baptisme.

To which I answer, that from his *translating* the word βρεφος Infants, to conclude him absolutely for *Infants Baptisme*, is to impose a *falsey* upon his Reader, when he knows the word signifies a state of *Childhood* also, that is capable of understanding, as it is taken 2 *Tim* 3. 15. And *that from a Child thou hast known the Scriptures*, the word is, ἀπὸ βρέφους. and therefore *Nazienzen* must be understood by his early *Consecration*, to mean not in the *Cradle*, but as he explains himself, so soon as they are capable to know *Mysteries*, except only in the case of danger of *death*; and which is to Baptise not so much a *Child* as a *dying* Person. And that he means not the *Infants state* is manifest, because in the same 40. *Oration* he hath these words (speaking of *those who decease without Baptisme:*) viz. *Neither can they Receive Baptisme, either perhaps by Reason of Infancy, or some altogether involuntary chance by which it is that even they who would, obtained not the gift.* Whereby it is manifest, that in his time *Infancy* was one of the *Obstacles* that hindred *Baptisme*,

tisme, and whereby Persons deceased without it. And therefore by that passage, in his third *Oration*, of all ages Receiving *Baptisme*, is to be understood, such only that are capable of *Instruction* in the *Faith*, and the *Mysteries* of that *Ordinance*, whether young *Men*, old *Men*, or *Fathers*, having before declared, is so dangerous to come unprepared to it. Therefore *Gregories* testimony, so much lean'd upon, to prove *Infants Baptisme* in this Century, signifies nothing. *And Doctor* Barlow *tells us that as* Tertullian *in the former Age condemn'd it, as an unwarrentable, and irrational Custom, so did* Nazienzen *(as he saith) dislike it too, and would not have them brought to Baptisme, till they were of some age, and able to answer for themselves, in his Oration* εἰς ἅγιον βάπτισμα.

But 'tis said, is it not manifest that in case of danger of death, he would have an *Infant Baptised*? It is true, but that was not *qua* Infant, but as a *dying Person*; and which was through a superstitious *conceit*, that *Baptisme* might save them; as some give the Eucharist, and Extream unction, when they are just departing; In like manner there was also in this Age an opinion, that some had to Baptise *Children*, to cure them of their *Bodily diseases*. Magd. Cent. 4. c. 6. p. 423. As they were grown Persons also in the next Age to cure them, *Aug.* to. 7. col. 89. c. But what are either of these to that *Ordinance of Baptisme*? *Tertullian* that, as Doctor *Barlow* tells us, was so great an opposer of *Infants Baptisme*, as *irrational*, and *unwarrentable*, yet had this fancy of Baptizing a *dying Child*, to save it; which signifies just nothing to the thing

Objection.

Answer.

Sick Persons Baptised for cure.

pleaded for, and that Persons may as well bring *Protogenes* for an Authority, that pretended to Baptize the sick Children of this Age to cure their *deceases*; as *Gregorie*, and *Tertullian* for Baptizing of dying Children, to save their Souls.

So that all our instances from the sayings of our *Eminent* Men, stands as yet firme for us, notwithstanding what Mr. *Wills* has said to the contrary.

Secondly, as to the *Decrees* of the three *Councels*, he saith this: *That if it must go by the number of Councels, they shall carry it; for if I name three, that must be supposed to be against Infants Baptisme, he thinks he should not exceed, if he said, he could name ten times three for it.* Besides he conceives, that *those three Councels mentioned by me, had respect only to Pagans, in those their Decrees from what Mr.* Marshall *had said in answer to that of Neocæsaria.*

His exceptions against the Councels very frivolous.

To his first answer, I say, It is *granted* I think (as I have made it ready to his hand,) he may quote the *Canons* of thirty *Councels*, for Infant Baptisme, in the following ages (and a stout argument, no doubt for it.) But what are such *Decrees* to this *fourth Century*, wherein I produce three for Believers Baptisme, upon *Profession* and *free choice*; and he not one in this time, (as indeed it is impossible he should) there being none found to ordain any *such thing*, till after this Century.

And as to his conception, that the *Neocæsarian* Councel means *only Pagans*, and not the *Children of Christian Women*, as he saith. Mr. Marshal *has made appear*, and therefore in his usuall civility to

me, how impudent it is in me to trouble us with this silly Ridiculous story.

He must therefore know, that he and *Mr. Marshal* both do miss the Case, the stress of the Decree lyes not about the Parent, but for the Exclusion of all Children, whether of *Pagan*, or *Christian* Parents; because confession, and free choice is required in that Sacrament. And therefore saith *Grotius* from the *Glossers*, *That an Infant cannot be Baptised, because it hath no power to confess, or choose the Divine Baptisme.* And which *speaks reason, saith Doctor* Tayler, *and intimates a practice which was absolutely universal in the Church, of interrogating the Catechumens, concerning the Articles of their Creed, which is our Argument, saith he, that either they did not admit Infants to Baptisme, or that they did prevaricate egregiously, in asking Questions of them, who themselves knew, were uncapable of giving answers.*

So that we have as little *prevaricated* in our *Councels*, as in our *Fathers*.

Thirdly, the next exception he makes, is against the *Instances* of those eminent Men not Baptised till aged, and of the ten before mentioned, he gives in exceptions only against four, *viz. Constantin, Nazienzen, Chrysostome*, and *Austin*.

Exceptions against 4 of the 10 not Baptised in their Infancy.

By which we have gained, *six* other unperverted *Authorities* more; and surely it is of much weight, that if six such eminent *Persons*, the Children of *Christian Parents* were not Baptised, till they could make a *Confession* of their Faith; it is a substantial *Argument*, that Believers Baptisme

tisme was the Baptisme generally *owned* in this Age, and that Infants Baptisme was not yet received as an *Apostolical Tradition*, and ordinance of Christ, whilst so many Renowned worthyes of this Age, the Parents of these great Men, should neglect to Baptize them in their *Infancy*, for the Argument lyes *there*, and not as Mr. *Willy* so weakly reasons, from some *misapprehensions* in the *parties themselves*, as in p. 17.

Constant. the Son of Christians Parents, as

But as to the Exceptions themselves: First, as to *Constantin*, if he, and Mr. *Marshal* doubt whether *Constantin* had Godly *Parents* at his birth: As good *Historians*, as they do not. As *Grotius* and *Dailly* witnessing, to *Helana's* Christianity before his birth, as p. 60. & 62. And the *Magdeburgs* to that of his Father, Cent. 4. p. 61. Out of *Eusebius* in these words, *Constantinus Constantii Imperatoris Filii, bonus a bono, pius a pio. Constantine the son of Constantius, a good man from a good, a holy man from a holy one.*

Dailly.

Magd.

Nazian. the Son of Christians Parents, as

As to that of *Nazienzen*, I wonder Mr. *Willy* should cavil about him, seeing he known the *Magdeburgs*, in the Account they give of his life tell us from such undeniable *Authority*; That his *Father Gregorius was a pious Bishop, and his Mother Nonna a gracious holy Woman before his Birth, and that she by prayer obtained this her son of God, and how from his youth he did patrizare & matrizare statim a puero Paternis moribus imbutus est*, Mag. Cent. 4. pag. 934. &c. Besides in confirmation thereof, Doctor *Hall* (as Mr. *Tombes* tell us) in his Honour to his married Clergy, 2 Book 8. Sect. saith: *That* Nazienzen *was begotten of his Father*

Magd.

Dr. Halls.

being a Bishop, and to prove it; brings his Mother's words, speaking to him to persuade him, to help him in his charge, which he translates out of the Greek, *viz.* **The years of thy age, are not so many as of my Pains-taking**, confirming what was said above out of the *Magdeburgs*.

As for *Chrysostome* he saith: *Mr.* Marshal saith, *it is uncertain, whether Father and Mother were Christians at his birth.* But as for that we will let it rest upon *Grotius's testimony*, as you have it p. 61. whom none can think a *partial* Author in this Case, being so firmly for Infants Baptisme, and without dispute so well read in Antiquity. Chrisost. Christian Parents, as Grotius.

And as for *Austin* I will recommend you to two instances, to make it good, and clear Mr. *Wills* doubts: The one is Doctor *Taylors* not in his Liberty of Prophecy (which *is excepted* against by Mr. *Wills*, but how warrentably we shall hereafter examine) but in one of his last pieces, *viz.* in his Defwasive against Popery, printed 1667. *where you have him in* Sect. 3. p. 117. *thus expressing himself: viz. That there is no pretense of Tradition, that the Church in all ages did Baptize all the Infants of Christian Parents: it is more certain that they did not do it, then that they did: in the first Age St.* Ambrose, *St.* Jerom, *and St.* Austin, *were born of Christian Parents, and yet not Baptised until the ful age of a man: and more that the Apostles did Baptize any Children, is not at all reported by any credible Tradition.* Austin Christian Parents, as Dr. Taylor.

The other is Mr. *Baxter*, an evidence that in this Case is not to be rejected, who is pleased to tell us in a very late piece, *viz.* his Principles of Love Mr. Baxter.

That he knew that in the days of Tertullian, Nazienzen, *and* Austin, *men had liberty to be Baptised, or to bring their Children, when and at what age they pleased, and that none were forced to go against their consciences therein. And that he knew not that our Rule or Religion is changed, or that we are grown any wiser or better then they. And again* Christian Direct. p. 827. *Thus*

That ancient Christians had liberty to let their Children stay till age, as they thought best. And that Austin, *and many Children of Christian Parents were Baptised at age.*

Dr. Barlow. And upon the whole, we may add what *Doctor Barlow* saith to this purpose, pag. 64. I am sure *that in the Primative times they were Catechumeni, then illuminati or Baptizati, and that not only Pagans, and Children of Pagans converted, but Children of Christian Parents also.*

Thus we have gone through our first *four Centuries*, and the *proofs* urged to this point of *History* from them; and therein I hope the Reader will fully acquit me, from that charge of *Prevarication*, in perverting the Authorities brought by me to *witness*, that in these times *Confession*, and *Profession* of *Faith*, was held necessary to *precede Baptisme.*

That only the Adult Baptised in the first ages confirmed by Divers. And that I am not mistaken, nor alone in my *apprehension* herein, I shall repeat a few, both of the *Ancient* and *Modern* Writers, that have so fully confirmed the truth hereof, *affirming* with much *positiveness, that* [*only*] the *Adult*, upon *Confession of Faith, were the Subjects of Baptisme in these first times.*

Wala-

Walafrid Strabo in Rebus Eccles. p. 26. *That in the first times the grace of Baptisme was wont to be given, to them* Only, *who were come to that integrity of mind and body, that they could know and understand, what profit was to be gotten by Baptisme; what was to be confessed, and believed, and lastly, what was to be observed by them that are new born in Christ.*

Beatus Rhenanus in Anotat. sup. Tertull. *saith: That the old custom was, that those that were come to their full growth, were Baptised with the Bath of Regeneration; which custom he said continued for some of the first Ages.* Rhenanus.

Rupertus in his 4. Book of Divine Offices cap. 18. *saith: That in former times the custom of the primative Churches was, that they administred not the Sacrament of Regeneration, but* Only, *to the Chatecumens, who were instructed in the Rules of Faith, Rehearsing the same.* Rupertus.

Jo. Bocanus Lib. 2. de Gent. Mor. *It was in times past, saith he, the Custom to administer Baptisme,* Only, *to those that were instructed in the Faith, &c.* Bocanus.

Doctor *Hamond* in his Cat. lib. 1. c. 3. p. 33. *saith,* That All Men *were instructed in the Fundamentals of Faith anciently, before they were permitted to be Baptised.* Dr. Hamond.

Mr. *Baxter* in his Saints Rest. part. 1. cap. 8. Sect. 5. *saith: That* Tertullian, Origen, *and* Cyprian, *who lived in the 2. and 3. Centuries, do all of them affirm, that in the primative times* None were Baptized, *without an express covenanting, wherein they renounced the World, Flesh,* Mr. Baxter.

and

and Devil; and engaged themselves, and promised to obey him.

The Testimonies for Adult Baptisme, after Infants Baptisme was enjoined.

In the next place, for further *confirmation* of this truth, I gave you in some *Testimony* that was born thereto, after *Infants Baptisme* was established, in the *sixth Century*; and that not only from those that denyed *Infants Baptisme*, but from those that owned and *practised* it; *Papists* and *others*, through the rest of the Centuries.

1. From particular Persons, 1. that denyed Infants Baptisme.

Of the first I produced several *Eminent men*, as particular witnesses, some of which I shall mention, *viz.*

Crescon.

Cresconius pag. 230, *who said that there was no true Baptisme, but such as was administred after Faith.*

Faustus.

Faustus Regienses. pag. 230. *That personal and actual desire was requisite, in every one that was to be Baptised.*

Albanus.

Albanus, who was put to death for his witness hereto, p. 230.

The Swermers

These eminent People, called Swermers, *in the sixth Century: That from Christ Example of Baptisme reproved, the evil custom of Infants Baptisme*, p. 231.

Bishop of Apamen,

The Bishop of Apamen, and Zoroaras, who did defend the Baptisme of Believers to be the only Baptisme, pag. 231.

Adrianus.

Adrianus Bishop of Corinth in the 7. Century, who did stoutly defend Believers Baptisme, not permitting an Infant to be Baptised in his Diocese, page 231.

Hincmar.

Hincmarus, Bishop of Laudum, refusing Infants Baptised, only Believers, 235.

The

The Egyptian Divines, *in the seventh Century, taught Faith before Baptisme, in opposition to the Romish Baptisme*, p. 232. Egyptian Divines.

Carolus, *Bishop of Maylant, taught that only such as were instructed, and confessed Faith, and manifested a holy life, were to be baptised.* Carolus.

Jacob de Roor, *owned only, that Baptisme that Christ commanded after teaching, and believing; and which the Apostles did also practise, and which, saith he, must needs be after believing, because it is for the burying of sin, the Bath of Regeneration, the Covenant of a Christian life, and the puting on the Body of Christ, and planting into the true Olive-tree Jesus Christ, and for the right entrance into the Spiritual Ark, &c.* Jacob de Roor.

Besides many others I *forbear* to *mention*, but refer you to the Book it self; And which I suppose are all *full*, *proper*, and *pertinent* witnesses in the case, and against none of which he makes any *exception*, and which I hope you will add to all the rest, besides the two he will please to allow me.

I do also bring into this evidence, besides many particular Persons, an Account of several *Churches*, that have in their Principles, and Practises, confirmed this of Believers Baptisme, after profession of Faith, and which are as followeth. 2. The Churches that denyed Infants Baptisme, witnessing for Believers only.

The Donatists *that taught that none should be baptised, but those that believed, and desired the same*, p. 222. 1. Donatists.

The Waldenses *that taught, that by Baptisme the Believers were Received into the holy Congrega-* 2. Waldenses.

tion, there professing, and declaring openly their Faith, and amendment of life, p. 239.

3. Germans. *The Churches of Christ in* Germany *owned, and contended for this Faith, and practise; and many sealed the same with their blood*, p. 157.

4. Helvetians. *The Churches in* Helvetia *asserted the same, and many suffered Bonds, and Martyrdom from Protestant Brethren, for the profession thereof*. p. 260.

5. Thessalonians. *The Churches in* Thessalonica *of the same Faith, and practise*, p. 76.

6. Flemings. *The Churches of Christ in* Flanders *asserting the same, and multitude of Martyrs that witnessed thereto by blood*, p. 267, &c.

7. Bohemians. *The Churches in* Bohemia *witnessing to this truth, and their great sufferings for the same*, pag. 271.

8. Hungarians. *The Churches of* Hungaria *of the same practice*, p. 274.

9. Poles. *The Churches in* Poland *of like Faith, and practise*, p. 274.

10. Transylvanians. *The Churches in* Transylvania *of the same practice*, 274.

11. English. *The Churches in this Nation owning the same Principle, and practise*; viz.

First, *In the time of the ancient* Britains, p. 226.

Secondly, *Under the name of* Lollards *from the* Waldensian *Barbe of that Name*, pag. 278. p. 203, 204.

Thirdly, *Under the name* Wickliffians, *who asserted also that Believers were the only Subjects of Baptisme*, p. 283.

And Lastly, *Since* Henry *the* Eight *time*, *under the name of* Anabaptists, p. 306.

Against

Against which latter testimony, from these respective Churches in these several Regions, he only excepts against the *Donatists*, *Waldenses*, and ancient *Britains*, denying that they were of this Faith and practise; which you have particularly replyed to in the third Chapter, where the witnesses against Infants Baptisme are defended.

But in the mean time it must be remembred, that the rest stand good, as *not excepted against*.

Secondly, you have the *Testimony*, born to this truth by many Eminent Men, and Churches, that have owned, and practised Infants Baptisme, since the imposing thereof; some of whom are these that follow, as you find them in the respective Centuries; *viz. Chrysostom*, *Austin*, *Gregory*, *Cassiodorus*, *Haimo*, *Rabanus*, *Anselm*, *Algerus*, *Ruperius*, *Lombard*, *Albertus*, *Bellarmine*, *Grotius*, *Luther*, *Calvin*, *Hamond*, *Daille*, *Taylor*, *Baxter*, *Church of England*. All or most of them, affirming with the Church of *England*, that Faith and Repentance is required in all those that are to be *Baptised*, *viz.* Repentance whereby *they forsake sin*, and Faith *whereby they stedfastly believe the Promises*.

To all which *Testimony* Mr. *Wills especially* quarrels me, for perverting, as he saith, their sayings, against there *intended* sences, by improving what they say for *Adult* Baptisme (wherein they meant *only Strangers* and *Pagans* converted to the Faith) against Infants Baptisme, which is in an *other way*, and upon an *other Account*. And for being so notoriously contradictious to my self, in saying they are for *Believers* Baptisme in one

Mr. Wills exception against this part for the Testimony.

part of the *History*, and yet the same Men, and *Councels*, for Infants Baptisme in an other.

Replyed to.

To which I say, that by Quoting their sayings, that are so expresly for us, though it may be not *intended* so, I have done no injury.

1. Not quoted for Anabaptist.

First, because I do not quote them as *Anabaptists*, or to prove that Believers Baptisme was the *only Baptisme* of those Centuries (that would have been madness, and contradiction with a witness, and which he seems to father upon me.

But [illegible] ad [illegible] them.

Secondly, because nothing is more fair or frequent, then to improve mens own *sayings* against themselves, for their better conviction and clearing the truth; as Mr. *Tombes* has brought Mr. *Baxters* 20. Arguments against *himself*, and therefore called his Book *Felo de se*; and no more injury done thereby, then Mr. *Tombes* saith; was done by Bishop *Morton*, in alledging the *Romanists* words in there *writings*, *as an Advocate for the Protestants against themselves, but right done thereby, as he saith, to the Church of God*. So that what they say respecting the *Commission*, for the necessity of *teaching*, *profession*, and *confession*, and so as their *words* necessarely exclude any other but such *capable* Subjects, what injury to improve it for the truth (and to which I have spoken much to prevent *Cavils* of this kind, as you'l find it p. 85, 86, and in the *Preface*.)

Austin so for Adult Baptisme, in words as to excuse Infants.

For instance, *If Austin* tells us in one place, *That none without due Examination, both to Doctrine and Conversation, ought to be Baptised, and that no ignorant or scandalous Person, without due instruction, and fruits of Repentance, are to be admit-*

ted

ted to Baptisme, what can be spoken more agreeable to truth, and more indeed to assert *Believers* Baptisme; to be the only Baptisme, and to exclude any other that are not capable to act Faith, or testefy fruits; for if no other, as he saith, then not Infants.

Yet the same *Austin* in contradiction hereto saith, *Let Infants be baptised by the Faith of another, to take away Original sin, without which they can neither be Regenerated or saved.* Now, compare these two together, what *sound Christian* will not say, that *Austin* before spoke the mind of *Christ*, in wholesome sound *word?* and herein his own words, if not corrupt and heretical; *For as one well observes that such Doctrine as this, was the greatest poyson, that ever the Father of Lyes powred into the hearts of Sinners*; to make People think, that sprinkling a little water on the face could Regenerate, take away sin, and save the Soul, and beget grace *ex opero operato* by the work done.

How weakly & contradictionally Austin asserts Infants Baptisme.

Calvin *in one place tells us, the due and right order of Baptisme from the Commission, saying thus*, viz. *That Men may rightly offer themselves, to Baptisme Confession of sins is required, otherwise the whole action would be nothing else but sport.*

2. Calvin for Believers Baptisme by Rule.

Yet in another place in contradiction hereto saith: *Let the Children of Believers be baptised, because God having taken their Parents into Covenant, they themselves are also to be imbraced in the same Covenant; Neither is Baptisme hereby separated from Faith and teaching, because though Children have not yet Faith, nor are capable of teaching, yet their Parents have both*

Calvin for Infants Baptisme, in contradiction hereto, without Rule.

But by what *Rule* or *Reason* this latter is urged, and how possibly to be Reconciled with the former, so agreeable to *bite*, is the knot to be untyed.

3. Mr. Baxter for Believers Baptisme, by precept & Example.

So also Mr. *Baxter* upon Christ Commission, *Matth.* 28. 20. This saith he, *sheweth the Disciples their several works in their several Orders*, viz. *First, to make Disciples, which Mark calls Believers. Secondly, is to Baptize them, whereto is annexed the promise of Salvation. Thirdly, to teach them all other things, which are after to be learned in the School of Christ: And that to contemn this order, is to contemn all Rules of Order; professing his conscience is fully satisfied from this Text, that it is one sort of Faith even saving, that must go before Baptisme, the Profession whereof the Minister must expect*, as pag. 3. *And again, if there can be no Example given in Scripture, of any one that was baptised without the Profession of saving Faith, nor any precept for so doing, then we must not baptize any without it. But the Antecedent is true, saith he, from the practice of all baptised in Scripture, which he particularly enumerates, and then saith, so is the consequence.*

What can be said more consonant to truth, more agreable to the *Scriptures*, and what more in *justification* to the Baptisme of *Believers*, and to the Excluding all others uncapable of Profession.

Mr. Baxter for Infants Baptisme, without Precept or Example.

And yet the same Mr. *Baxter* tells us, that an Infant is to be Baptised: but by what Rule? Why, saith he, upon the Account of his Parents Faith? But where is that to be found in the *Pre-*

cept? Is it baptize the believing *Parent* and his Child? is that found in the order of the *Commission*, or is a Child to be found in all the *pregnant* Examples, in the New Testament, that he hath given us?

When Mr. *Baxter*, or any one in his behalf, can reconcile Mr. *Baxter* to Mr. *Baxter*; *Austin* to *Austin*; *Calvin* to *Calvin*, I shall own my mistake herein, till then must believe, that it is good service, to improve their *contradictions* to *themselves*, and for the service of that *truth*, that they so vigourously oppose.

But thirdly, there is no injury done to them in the sence, that most of the Doctors, both *Papists* and *Protestants*, have given us themselves, respecting those *expressions*, about the necessity of *Repentance* and *Faith*, before *Baptisme*, and how they reconcile them to Infants *Baptismes*. And which we have so fully done to our hand, in the *English* Liturgy, that will put it out of *doubt*. You know it is there expresly told *us*, that *Faith* and *Repentance* is required, in all that are to be *baptised*. [*good and sound Doctrine.*] But then the Question, you know, is put: *How do Infants*, who by reason of their tender age cannot perform them? *viz.* can neither Repent nor Believe, [*sound Doctrine still.*] To which they answer, *Yes*; they do perform them by their sureties; So that we are to understand, that though Infants cannot Repent nor *Believe*, which yet is so necessarly *required* in every one that is to be *baptised*, yet that others may *undertake* for them, answer the *Commission* for them, *Repent*, *Believe*.

3. Reply. No injury done them from their own expositions of their sayings.

Confess for them, and declare a *willingness* in their name to be baptised; and this is actually *done* by the *sureties*, as our English *Liturgy* directs (and every dayes experience tells us in the Christning of Children) which interpretes to us, the *ancient* way of *Interrogating* Sponcers, and which is performed after this manner: *viz.* The *Priest* saith to the surety, *Doest thou forsake the Devil, and all his works, &c.* Then the surety must answer, *I forsake them all.* Priest, Then, *Doest thou believe in God the Father*, rehearsing *the Creed*? S. To which he is to answer, *All this I steadfastly believe.* P. then, *Will thou be baptised into this Faith?* *Yes*, saith the Surety in the name of the Child, *that is my desire.* This was the Custom of old, and with Infants Baptisme established, (though *it is true they had Sureties, or Witnesses, for grown Persons, before Infants Baptisme was enjoyned.*) Yet now because the Commission required Faith and Repentance, therefore was this *invention* found out to answer it. And therefore saith *Lud. Vives* in his Comment. l. 1. c. 27. *That none were baptised of old, but those of age, who did not only understand what the water meant, but desired the same.*

How by Sureties Infants do confess & profess Faith and Repentance, and so capable of Baptisme.

The perfect Image whereof, saith he, we have yet in our Infants Baptisme; for it is asks of the Infant, will thou be baptised? for whom the Sureties answer, I will; And so saith Strabo *pag.* 60. *and* Jo. Boemus *p.* 73.

Lud. Vives why sureties invented for Infants.

Magdeburg Century 5. p. 516. *Infantes alieno Fide baptisari; Infants are to be baptised by the Faith of another.*

There-

Therefore called *Pedobaptists*, or *Sureties*, that plight Faith for them; and *Sponsors*, that undertake Promise, Vow, and Renownce for them.

So that this appears, to be the *untying* the *knot*, the *Reconciling* of the seeming difficulty, of the necessity of *Confession*, *consent*, and *desire* with *Infants Baptisme*, so making the *Commission* but one general Rule, to baptise both *Adult* and *Infants*, the Adult by his own Mouth and Faith, the Infant by the Mouth and Faith of another. Therefore all these sayings of these latter *Doctors*, and learned *Men*, speaking to the nature of *Baptisme*; wherein *Confession* and *Profession* is required, is to be understood, not as Mr. *Wills* would have it, to intend only *Adult Persons*, *Pagans*, and *Heathens*, but to intend *Infants* also; otherwise it would be to make two Baptismes, and necessitate two *Commissions*: one for the *Adult*, and the other for *Infants*. But in as much, as none is to be found for the latter, they include and involue all in the former.

Therefore by my producing, these proofs from all the *Pædobaptists*, as the true sence of the *Commission*, and a general *Rule* to baptise upon, it will be manifest, that I do not bring them contrary to the *mind* of the Writers, being urged to *confirm* and establish *Believers* Baptisme, according to Christs *Commission*. The *Lutherans* are positive, that Children have *actual Faith*, and in Baptisme hear the *Word*, *use Reason*, *&c.* And all the rest, that others Repent, Believe, Profess, Confess, desire for them, *viz.* either the Surety, or the Parent.

But

Objection. But 'tis said, you carry it further, and *improve* their generall Rule for Believers Baptisme, against *Infants Baptisme*, contrary to their intention because they intend Infants not otherwise to be baptised, but as professed Believers in this way.

Answer. To which I say, that it truly serves the *Intention*, wherefore it is brought under this *Head*, where we do not so *immediately* concern our selves against *Infants*, which is an *other part*, but for Believers *only*; though I grant consequentially it doth so, for if a personal Professing of *Faith*, be only *intended* in the Commission, and that no such thing as a surety is to be *found* in that Text, or any other, to profess or confess, for an other, so as to warrant, the party confess'd for, to be a proper subject of Baptisme.

Then it will follow, that all those sayings, make *only for Believers* in their own *Persons*, to the excluding all that are uncapable of Personal *Confession* and *Profession*: When any such thing as a surety in Baptisme, *to believe*, *repent* and *confess* for an other is made out from Scripture, they may have Reason to complain, but till then, no injury is done, so to clear the truth, from their own *grants* and sayings. But that there is no such thing in the Scripture, take the acknowledgement of some of their own party.

Magd. against sureties. The *Magdeburgs* Century 1. p. 497. *Do tell us, that God-Fathers, or Fidejussors* for Infants, *or others, they find nothing of in the Scriptures; that in the second of the Acts they offred themselves to Baptisme, & that it would be very ridiculous to think, the Apostles would baptise none without Sureties.*

And

And Doctor *Taylor* pag. 84. *I know, saith he, God might if he would have appointed God-Fathers, to give answer in the behalf of Children, and to be Fidejussori for them, but we cannot find any authority or Ground, that he hath, and if he had, that it is to be supposed he would have given them Commission, to have transacted the solemnity with better circumstances, and have given answers with more truth; for the Question is asked of Believing in the present, and if the God-Father answer, in the name of the Child, I do believe, it is notorious, they speak false and ridiculous, for the Infant is not capable of Believing, and if it were, he were also capable of dissenting, and how then do they know his mind? and therefore, saith he,* Tertullian *and* Gregory Nazienzen *gave advice, that the Baptism of Infants shall be deferred, till they could give an account of their own Faith.* If you would be further satisfied about these Sureties or Gossips, why and for what use, *viz.* for Bells and Churches, and grown Persons as Infants, read pag. 84. 100. 128, 129, and 141. Dr. Taylor against Sponsors, and his Reasons.

But if you will not *admit* of God-Fathers, what do you say to *Fathers?* why may not they *Repent*, and *Believe* for the *Child*, and so answer the *Commission*, especially being a believing Parent, and in Covenant, according to what Mr. *Wills* represents from Mr. *Calvin?* p. 2. Object.

To which I say, that if you betake to that, you quit all your Antient Authorities, that depend upon *sureties*, where the Parent is expressly *forbidden* that Rite, none being permitted to undertake for his Child, neither Father nor Answer.

Mo-

Mosheim, as *Vincentius* tells us at large, from the Decrees of the Councels, ch. 93. p. 92. Mr. *Baxter* owning it against the Canon-Law also. Neither will you find one *syllable* in all the New *Testament*, to relieve you; and therefore must either find out a New *Commission*, for baptizing Persons without personal *Repentance*, *& Faith*, or renounce the practice of sprinkling Infants, that are so uncapable to do any thing *thereof*. And which case you have very fully, and honestly put by Master *Baxter*, in his Christian Directory pag. 817. And how well resolved you have it remarkt, pag. 217. and worthy of your perusal, upon this point especially; it being brought herein, into such a *narrow* compass, for if no Scripture *ground* to baptize an Infant, by a *Gossip or Parents* Faith and *Confession*, then Infants Baptisme is certainly a *nullity*, and out of doors by their own *grants*. And therefore till Mr. *Baxter*, or some Body else, *give* us a better solution in that case of *Conscience*, we may say in his own words: That for Persons to be baptised without a *profess'd Covenant*, is a Baptisme not of Christs appointment, and that being done without Repentance and Faith, is a prophanation saith Mr. *Baxter*, and ridiculous saith *Calvin*.

Now, therefore upon the whole, let the Reader judge, whether my severall proofs are not *full*, *proper*, and *pertinent*; And whether Mr. *Wills* upon the closing of his seventh Chapter, respecting my proofs upon the Centuries, hath spoken like a judicious, *sober*, *considerate* Person; in saying:

That

That besides Jo. Boemus *and* Strabo, *he may truly say, that from the beginning of the Century to the end, this* Unfaithful Man *hath perverted the sayings of all Authors, which he hath quoted, and upon consideration of his carriage herein, I am confident of those two things:*

First, that never any Writer did more prevaricate, and shew more Falshood then he hath done.

Secondly, that he would certainly have forborn, if he had thought, any man would have been at the trouble, to examine and search whether he saith truth or no.

I say, *it is referred to judgement*, whether any sober man can judge, Mr. *Wills* has read the Book he so *contems*, vehemently *aspersos*, and inveighs against; Or *secondly*, if he hath, whether he did consider what was either writen by the Author, or by himself in answer? And *thirdly*, If so, whether he *ought not to be* esteemed a *Person* extreamly void of *Reason* or *Conscience*, and that prejudice did more prevail with him then impartial *judgement?* My Appeal upon the proofs and the Prevarication charged.

Secondly, concerning the Falshoods he charges me with. 2. The Falshoods.

BUt in the next place, if it be supposed, the Authorities aforesaid are full and proper, and that I am acquit of the Prevarications; yet what do I say to so many Falshoods charged upon me, *in the egregious abuse put upon so many* Authors, *in leaving out, and curtailing some of their sayings, and adding to others, pretending they*

say

say, that which they do not, and so making Authorities of my own, the chapter and page being so punctually given in against me.

Answer 1. To which I say, First, it seems to carry much *weight in it*, and the rather, because it proceeds from one that professes himself, a solid grave Person, a *Minister* of the Gospel, and *Master of Arts*, and a *learned man*; and one that besides hath spent so much time *lately*, as he tells us, in the *University Library at Oxford*, to trace these *Quotations* and to detect their *errors*, & deliver them with so much *certainty*, that nothing (as is that confident boast he expresseth it) but an Index *Expurgatorius* can *Relieve* me, and which is not to be had in *England*.

2. And secondly, I must needs grant, that if I acquit not my self *herein*, I may very well be esteemed, the unworthy Person that he would indeed render me to be, that is *guilty* of so much *Prevarication*, *Forgery*, and *Falshood*.

3. But then thirdly, I hope it will be granted on the other hand, that if all these *proove forgeries* of his own, and no truth in any one of *them*, that then such a *Stratagem* bespeaks no less *malignity* to my Person, then to the truth *witnessed* by me, and that he hath justly *contracted* to himself, the *Odium*, and infamy he would *Reflect* upon me, according to the equal decision, given us in the Case, *Deut.* 19. 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21. *Prov.* 19. 15.

Therefore to the *Examination* of the charge I freely joyn issue with him, in order to the *Pa[illegible] trial*, at whose door the Falshoods lye; for [illegible]

fully [illegible] of us (it must be agreed on all hands) is notoriously guilty, and so we shall proceed to the particulars, as we find them in order.

The first whereof he thus begins with, in his Preface, &c. *He hath much injured the famous History of the Magdeburgenses, in very many places, by misrepresenting what they say: As that they tell us, that in the first Century* the Apostles Baptised only the aged, *which (saith he) is false, for he himself added the word* Only, *as it seems (he saith) ch. 7. part 1. p. 2. Where he again repeates it, saying, that the* Magdeburgs *in Century 1. l. 2. c. 6. p. 496. do not say,* that the Apostles Baptised only the Adult. And again in *his* pag. 38. *mentioning my Repetition of that aforesaid saying, of the* Magdeburgs *gives the following return.* 1. Falsehood charged. 2. Falsehood charged.

Very good Sir, Now you have learned to set down things right, but why did you say in the 56. (of the first Impressions) *that the Magdeburg as to the Subjects of Baptisme tell us* [That in this age they only Baptised the Adult] *was this, saith he, Lapsus calami aut mentis: The slip of the tongue, or the mind.*

To which I say, that it is most manifest, that this injurious man doth charge a *Falsehood*, of his own making, upon me three *several* times; for he can find no such *words* in my Book. My *words are expressly* thus: viz. *As to the Subjects of Baptisme they,* viz. *the Magdeburgs tell us: That in this Age* [they since] *they baptised only the Adult, or Aged, &c.* I do not say, that they tell us, that in this Age they [*baptised only the Adult*] 1. Answered.

Adult] these are his words. But that they [illegible] us, they find *they baptised only the Adult*, for [illegible] they tell us, they find *Examples* for the one, [illegible] for the other. And if I have not guessed right, let any sober Man in his sences judge, they tell us in these words: *Baptizatos esse Adultos, tum Judaeos, tum Gentes exempla probant*, Act. 2. 8. 10. 16. 19. *De Infantibus Baptizatis quidem mentata non leguntur*: That Examples testify (from the aforesaid Scriptures) *that the Adult, both Jews, and Gentiles were baptised*; But of the baptizing of Infants, they read not of one Example upon Record. So that if they find many Examples for the one, and none for the other, well it may be said, they find Examples, *only* for the one, *viz.* for the *Adult*: For they are not my Translation of the words (and therefore I add not the word [Only] to them, as he falsly suggested) but my sence upon those their words, and no other then I presume every one will give. And wherein his shameful (Distance, as he calls it, or) heedlessness is the more to be remark'd, for he himself in his first words of the 7. chap. 1. part. doth repeat my words, as I express them, *viz.* [*that they find only the Adult or Aged, whether Jews or Gentiles, baptised in the Century.*] And afterwards charges me three times over with the saying an other thing, *inculcating* it with many agrivating *circumstances*, and as worthy of the greatest observation, puts it in the Van of the *Falshood*. And it was one of the first things that I met with, from a *Friend* that was in his Book-sellers *Shop*, where some [illegible]

1. Falshood charged.

3. Falshood charged.

2. Answ.

1. Answered.

[illegible]

[illegible] *aisters* were bound to say, upon the reading thereof, that I wanted *morality*, in so dealing with Authors; Though truly if I had said the word, I do no know where such a hainous *crime* had *lain*. So that this is plain to you, that first I neither said *those words*; Nor secondly, did I add the word only *to the Author*.

In the next place, in his Preface he tells us, of two other *misrepresentations*; viz. *That I say, the* Magdeburgs *tell us, that the Custom of dipping the whole Body in water, was changed into sprinkling a little water in the face, in the first Century. Whereas there is not* (as he saith) *the least hint of this matter in this Century, nor the following; but the contrary, for they tell us, as* pag. 4. part. 1. *the word* Βαπτίζω, *signifies abluo, luo*; viz. *to wash; and that the Christian Baptisme, was taken from the Jewish washings, of which the Apostle speaks* Heb. 9, 10. *divers Baptismes.* And *so saith he, the Author fathers that upon the Century Writers, which they speaks not.*

Wherein these two Falshoods are charged upon me: First, in bringing the *Magdeburgs*, to assert the Ceremony of *Baptisme* to be by dipping, which they do not, but the contrary. 3. Falshood charged.

Secondly, In *affirming* that they say, the rite was *changed* in that Century, from *dipping* to *sprinkling*, when *there is not the least hint, either in this, or the following Century, of any such thing.* 4. Falshood charged.

To the first (that I am not mistaken, when I tell you) that they do assert the Rite of Baptizing to be by dipping, let their own words determine (the substance whereof I before gave 3. Answer.

[illegible] of *Popes*, *Emperors*, and *Cornicels*; [illegible] they have [illegible] in the [illegible] tryes; 'tis confessed they were driven into) [illegible] all this by ancient *Records* and authentick *Testimony*, which I presume I have (as yet) undeniably done.

Then I rest confident; that the *judicious* Reader will acquit me of this *slander*, of an *ipse dixit*, and that it is only my will, and *pleasure*, to say *this* of my own head, and Fancy without *proof*. The *German Baptists* do in their *Martyrology* prove their *dissent* from the *Waldenses*, throughout the *Centuries*. *Perin* tells us, that *Lollard* was a *Waldensian Barbe*, and that *Jo. Wickliff* asserted no other but the Doctrine of the *Waldenses*, being instructed therein by the *Lollards*.

This further Testimony I have met with, in the *Dutch* Book of Martyrs, which I desire the Reader to take notice of, as full measure, and heaped up, as Mr. *Wills* words it.

Cæsarius. First, They tell us, from *Jacob Merningus* p. 733. Cent. 13. ch. 5. out of *Cæsarius*, That the *Waldenses*, and *Albigenses*, *have rejected Infants Baptisme*, *saying that it is of no force*, *nor profitable to any*, *before they are taught*, *and do believe*, *but concerning that Baptisme*, *according to Christs appointment*, *they have a very high value*, *and esteem*. Dutch Martyr, pag. 307.

Dubravius &c. Secondly, That the *Waldenses were called Anabaptists*, *long before* John Hus, *they quote the testimony of seven of*, *viz.* *Dubravius*, *Michovius*, *Gomerus*, *Mr. Glanius* from *Merningus* p. 733.

Rainerius. Thirdly, That the said *Merningus* pag. 61[illegible]

619. [illegible] *Kainerius* [illegible]
[illegible]
the 12. Century, *That the Waldenses did deny Infants Baptisme, and produced divers of Kainerius his Arguments, against them for the same, and which he quotes from the* Bib. Patrum Tom. 13. p. 300. Though Mr. *Wills* is pleased to tell us p. 97. *that* Kainerius *saith never a word, about their denying Infants Baptisme.*

Fourthly, they tell us, that *Balthazar Lydias*, in his *Treat. of the Church, and of the Waldenses*, p. 86. Col. 1. tells us, *that they reprove many things in the Popish Sacraments, and say, that the baptizing of Children is not profitable to them*, Dutch Martyr p. 309. Balthazar Lydias.

Fifthly, *That* Abraham Mellinus *in his History of Martyrs*, p. 447. Col. 1. *doth tell us, That the* Waldenses *do cast far from them all the Sacraments of the Romish Church, and amongst them, do wholly reject that of Infants Baptisme, as unprofitable, and unnecessary*, Dutch Martyr. p. 320. Ab. Mellinus.

And therefore the whole of this Story concerning this ancient honourable People, the *Waldenses* is submitted to judgement, and whether I have not good cause to conclude it, with the return (of Mr. *Wills* his own words upon himself) which he speaks to me upon this very occasion, p. 44. *viz.*

And is it not a miserable Cause indeed, whose Advocates must still have recourse to lies for its defence, and an Argument of the want of honesty and conscience for Men to persist in that Course, when more than enough hath been said, to convince Mr. Wills his words returned upon himself.

them of the evil thereof, Is was a solemn Robust, which Job *gave his mistaken Friends, &c. Will you lye (saith he) for God? Surely he hath no need of, nor doth he require us by any sinister, and sinful way, to justify him in his attributes, providences, cause, or truth. As touching the matter in hand before us, If the Pædobaptists have the truth on their side, yet certainly it is little beholding to some of them, who have attempted to defend it by so many unwarrentable wayes. In particular I have made it appear, that the present Author, with whom I have to deal with, is fowly criminal, in laying out the utmost of his skill, in traducing those famous ancient Christians, as if in their several Generations (heretofore) they had not witnessed for Believers, against Infants Baptisme, when he cannot, but knew they were not only falsly, and maliciously charged (but cruelly, and murderously handled) by their Anti-Christian Enemyes, for their faithful witness to these dispised truths, &c.*

The witness born by the Donatists, *against Infants Baptisme, confirmed.*

Donatists. THe next witness he opposeth, is that of the *Donatists*, concerning whom I gave divers *Authorities*, proving that they did *deny Infants Baptisme.*

To which Mr. *Wills* is pleased to say, *that it is only my ipse dixit, and that I do thereby render my self guilty, of a great mistake, to say, that of them whereas neither the Magdeburgs, nor Danæus in his Opusculum, nor several other Writers, do charge any such thing upon them.*

To

To which I say, that herein Mr. *Wills* deals, according to his wonted manner, very *disingeniously* with me, First, That having given so many *Authorities*, and of such *Antiquity* to prove it, to tell the Reader, it is my *Ipse dixit* only. Secondly, To deny them, and yet give no just *exception* against them. Thirdly, To produce the negative (or silence rather) of some modern Authors, to oppose so many *positive Authorities*, produced by me, one of which, in all pleas, is worth a hundred Negative ones. Mr. Wills very disingenious.

But that the Reader may be *satisfied*, I had good *warranty*, to justify my said *proofs*, and that it was not my *Ipse dixit* only, I shall give them briefly to you, with what I have since met with, to confirm the same, which are as followeth, *viz.*

First, From what is mentioned of *Donatus* himself, who, as *Sebastian Frank* in his *Chronicle* saith, *did teach, that no Infant should be baptised, but only those, that believed, and desired it*, p. 222. Donatus himself.

Secondly, from what we find mentioned, of his Followers, *viz.* Donatists his followers *viz.*

Cresconius, who did *oppose Austin in that point*, as saith *Jacob Merning*, p. 230, *who was a Donatist, as say the* Magdeb. Cen. 5. p. 631. 1. Cresconius.

Fulgentius, another *learned Donatist*, as the Magdeb. tell us Cent. 5. p. 631. *did deny Infants Baptisme, and assert only that Baptisme, that was after Faith*, Vicecom. L. 3. c. 3. p. 66. 2. Fulgentius.

Vincentius Victor, another *who denyed Infants Baptisme*, as saith Vicom. L. 1. c. 2. *out of Austin Lib.* 3. c. 14. *de Anima*. 3. Vincentius.

Austin. Thirdly, It doth appear, from what we find in *Austin* 3. and 4. Books Tom. 7. c. 23. p. 43. *written against the Donatists*, wherein with much zeal and fury, he manageth the Argument for Infants Baptisme against them, bitterly cursing those that oppose it, p. 123. Also in his Epistle *Marcellin.* Tom. 7. c. 6. p. 724. *he opposeth him, against them, for denying Infants Baptisme.*

Eckbertus & Emericus. Fourthly, *Eckbertus* and *Emericus*, learned Writers in the twelfth Century, contending against the *Waldenses*, or Catheri, *for denying Infants Baptisme*, do say, *that the new Catheri viz. the Waldenses then, did in that point conform to the old Catheri, the Donatists, and Novatians*, p. 824.

Tho. Waldens. *Thomas Waldon*, that wrote against *Wickliff*, *Henry* the fourth's time, tells us, *that Vincentius Victor, with whom* Austin *contended, did say Baptisme is little avail*, De Sacram. Tit. 53. fol. 118.

Osiander, Fuller, & Bullinger. Fifthly, Our latter Writers, do also agree herein, that the *Donatists*, and modern *Anabaptists*, were all one, *so saith Osiander*, Cent. 1. p. 176. *And Fuller in his Eccles. Histor.* lib. 5. pag. 229. *And Bullinger* Lib. 5. fol. 216, 217. *of Baptisme.*

Spanhem. *Spanhemius* also saith, *that the Donatists Infants Baptisme, as appears, saith he, Austin Book against the Donatists*, c. 23, 24, 25. Spanheh. 4. p. 45.

Sixthly, Because the *Donatists* and *Novatians* both one in Doctrine, were acknowledged to be the same in Principle with the *Waldenses*,

that the *Novatians*, banished by *Innocent the third out of Rome*, *As saith Socrat.* l. 7. c. 9. did dwell in *Italy*, and *Dalmatia*, and were called by the same name with the *Walcenses*, viz. *Cathari*, and Fratricilli, in so much as *Paris* judges, they were the same *People*, and *Osiander* confesseth, that the *Albigen* came from *Rome*, Cent. 13. l. 1. ch. 4. p. 329.

Therefore it is left to the judicious *Reader*, whether I am not sufficiently justifyed, by this six fold *testimony* in my affirming, that the *Donatists* did deny *Infants* Baptisme; and that they may well be reckon'd amongst the *number of my witnesses*, and against whom Mr. *Wills* has made no just *Exception*.

But in the next place, Mr. *Wills* tells us, *that if it be taken for granted, they were against Infants Baptisme, they being, as he confesseth, in many things so like Anabaptists, yet by what appears from Mr.* Fox, *as he tells us out of* Eusebius, *and from Austins works, as say the Magdeburgs, that I have no reason to boast of my Authority, for both* Novations, and Donatists, *were vile Persons, and always counted for Heretics.* Mr. Wills standing the Donatists.

To which I say, that if I should *acknowledge* them as corrupt, as *Origen*, *Cyprian*, *Austin*, and *Chrysostom*, and others of his great witnesses; that held for *Chrysme*, *Exorcisme*, and other *Superstitions*, and that *Regeneration* was effected, in the very *all* of Baptisme, and that without *Baptisme*, and the *Eucharist*, no Child could be saved, yet their witness as to matter of *fact*, is to be owned, which is all I produce them for; not Answered.

undertaking to defend them, in all the Tenets fathered upon *them*, more then Mr. *Wills* does those that are so undenyably charged upon his witnesses, yet this he must give me leave to say, in vindication of the *Donatists*, and *Novations*, *viz.*

First, For the *Novations*, that what Mr. *Fox* speaks of them, from *Eusebius*, an Author of no great *fame*, is the less to be regarded, because he was a great friend to the *Arians*, and the *Novations* great *Impugners* of them, and upon that score it was he spoke very *maliciously* of them; though *Socrates*, an Author of better Account, speaks very honourably of them; And *Albaspanæus upon Optat. Milevitan*, *bespeaks them a very worthy People*, *in his* 20. *Observation*.

Magd. say no mention in old Writers of their Doctrines.

And as for the *Donatists*, the *Magdeburgs* tell us, that they wonder, that there is no more mention of them by the Ecclesiastical Writers, of this Age, either by *Sozamus*, or others; and that only *Theodoret*, in his Heretical Fables, gives some hints of them; And that the *Hypotheses* of their *Dogmes*, they gathered not from any of their *writings*, which were not extent, but out of *Austins* works, [*their great Opposer*] Cent. 4. c. 5. p. 376, 377. and from whom it is that Mr. *Wills* takes his *scheame*.

Mr. Wills fetchethall from Austin their great Enemy.

But how any can take a good *measure* from their sevearst *Enemy*, to make a judgement against them, and condemn them for *Heretickes*, I see not; for may you not from *Calvins* writings, pick as great a charge against the *Lutherans*; and as great against the Sacramentarians, out

out of *Luthers* writings? Alas what a sad People doth Mr. *Edwards* make the Independents; and what a dismal black line, do the *Prelates* draw upon the Presbyterians; and the Papists again upon them; and what a sad generation are Anabaptists, if Mr. *Wills* may be believed; Schisme being in all the incensing crime, which draws forth all the gall, and wormwood; and just so it was betwixt *Austin*, who was so *Catholick* in his Communion, and the Donatists, that prest for more purity in their separations, and from whence it was, that all that durt was flung upon them, and they put into such Beard skins, as Mr. *Wills* puts his Opposites in.

And for those Decrees of Councels, that past upon them for Hereticks, is no good ground to conclude against them, for so they judge the purest Doctrine, and holyest walking in many Ages, witness our Saviour himself, who was censured for a Blasphemer, and the Apostles, and Saints in every Age ever since; and who more censured for Heresy, then the *Waldenses*, *Lollards*, and *Wickliffians*, their Followers, and Disciples, that were so truly Orthodox.

The Witness said to be born against Infants Baptisme, by the Ancient Britains, *defended.*

THe last witness he opposeth, is that born by the *Ancient Britains*, and that they denyed Infants Baptisme. I gave the following *Answers*, and which you have at large, p. 226. First, Ancient Britains.

Why they deny Infants Baptisme.

First, Because Mr. Fox tells us, out of Bede, and Fabian, and others; that they refused to baptise after the manner of Rome, which Fabian as I find, more particularly explains, to be in the point of Infants Baptisme; and in confirmation thereof gave five Arguments. First, Because they kept themselves, both in Discipline, and Doctrine, so expresly to the Scripture, (there being no express Scripture for Infants Baptisme, as confest on all hands.) Secondly, Because they were such zealous impugners of Tradition, that being as Austin confesseth, the only Divine Authority for it. Thirdly, Because Constantine, the Son of Christian Parents, was not baptised in this Island in his Infancy. Fourthly, Because their custom was to baptise after Confession of Faith, being in Union, and Communion therein with the French Christians, whereof Instances are given. Fifthly, From the Question that was here put to Austin; viz. how long a Child, that was not in danger of death, might stay unbaptised, which he could not resolve, till he sent to Rome for the Solution. And to which we may add, what the Magdeburgs tell us from Hilaries testimony, p. 55. that none but the Adult were baptised, in the Western Churches, in his time.

Mr. Wills opposeth Fabians testimony from Bede.

To which he replyes as followeth: First, as to that of Fabians testimony, he saith, it is only a mistaken Paraphrase of Bede; and that Bede mentions nothing hereof. And therefore gives what Austin replyed to the Brittains, in Bedes words L. 2. c. 2. viz. That in as much as you discourage to our Custom [in many things] yea, to the Custom of the Un-

Universal Church, [illegible] *in these 3 things*, viz. *that you keep Easter in its proper time*, *Administer Baptisme*, *whereby we are born of God*, *after the manner of the Church of Rome*, *and the Apostolical Church*; *and preach the Word of God*, *together with us*, *unto the English Nation*, *we will patiently bear all other things you do*, *although contrary to our Customs*; *but they answered*, *they would none of these*, *nor own him for Arch-bishop*.

To which I say, that it doth appear from his Repetition out of *Bede*, that *Fabian* has fully hit his *meaning*: *First*, Because he tells the British Christians, that amongst many things where in they were contrary to the Church of *Rome*, one was in this particular about Baptisme, wherein they did not only contradict the Universal, but Apostolick Church. Now this must needs be in their refusing to *baptise* Children; First, Because as to the baptizing the *Adult*, they were not contrary to the Church of *Rome*, the Universal, or Apostolical Church, as appears p. 23 S. Secondly, Neither could it respect the particular *Mode*, Rite, or *Ceremony* of Baptisme; for the Custom of the Church of *Rome* was not *Universal*, which was so much opposed by the Greeks, and Eastern Churches, and not at all to be made out to be *Apostolical*. Thirdly, Therefore must needs respect Infants *Baptisme*: First, Because the Church of *Rome* had particularly *enjoined*, and *imposed* it, to beget Infants to *Regeneration*, that they might be born of *God*, as the words of their Canons demonstrate, and which words carry the

Answer. Fabian did not mistake Bede and why.

Re-

Reason, and ends of it, and that they intended the substance, and not the particuler Ceremony of the Ordinance. Secondly, Because Infants Baptisme was so universaly received in this several Age, in other parts of the World, to this time here mentioned. Thirdly, Because it was also received, and *enjoined* to be an *Apostolical practice*. Fourthly, It would have been *Childish*, and *ridiculous*, to have said Baptisme in general was *Apostolical*, which none ever denyed, and so full before received by them; therefore *Austin* could intend nothing else, nor *Bedas* words import any thing else; which therefore *Fabian* did fully, and significantly represent, in saying, *gave Christendom to Children*, viz. *let them as the Church of Rome has received, and enjoined it, be born of God by Baptisme, and become Christians, as soe generaly also received.*

And for Mr. *Wilds* saying, *They did no more reject Infants Baptisme, then they did preaching to the Saxons with Austin*; Is very true, having as much Reason to reject the one, as the other, for by preaching here with them, must be understood Authoritively, by being ordained by them, that they might not preach, as they did, as a company of Lay-men, and Mechanicks, but to be set apart thereto by this Apostolical Embassador, [or proud *Lordly Prelat*,] which they refused, not admitting him therein, to be their Arch-Bishop, and which explains *Austins* meaning in the business of preaching, and their denying thereof; which they had as good Cause to do, as to deny their Romish Infants Baptisme, and their Superstitious, Obser-

vation

vation of Easter; And therefore it was, that this Ante Christian Wolf did devoure, and worry this Flock of Christ, because they refused the *Popish Baptisme*, and *Ministry*. Secondly, As to those five other *Arguments* given by me, to confirm the former, he saith, they are meer *trifles*, (which is an Excellent way of *Answering*, and next to *Bellarmin* thou lyest) which is submitted to judgement.

And Lastly, He gives another Argument, why the *Brittains* were not against Infants Baptisme; *viz.* Because *Pelagius who, as he saith, was one of their Fellow Monks of Bangor, yet did owne Infants Baptisme, which was two hundred years before this, and which was a good Argument, that they did also.* Mr. White saith, Pelagius was a Monk of Bangor, & for Infants Baptisme.

To which I say, that as to *Pelagius* being one of these Old *Brittains*, and belonging to this very People, is by no good Authority to be found; For though it is true, *Humphry, Loyd* and *Mr. Fuller*, do so guess, yet they produce no Antient Author to confirm it; It is true, in *Austins* 106. Epist. he is called *Pelagius Brito*, to distinguish him from another *Pelagius* of *Terentius*; but whether because he was sent into that Nation, or of it, not certain. Questionable.

But Secondly, If it be granted, that he was a *Brittain*, and *one* of these Monks, it no more follows, that they must all be for *Infants Baptisme*, because he was so, then that they were all for the *Pelagian Heresy*, because he was the Author thereof; which it is eminently known they rejected, when they sent for the help of those famous *French* Christians, *Germanus*, and *Lupus*, who were It follows not that the Brittains where of his judgement, & why.

sent to them again, and again, from the Elders and Ministers about *Lyons*, to expel that Poyson, and therefore do I call them the *Waldesian Christians*, who inhabited those parts where their abode was, *Magdeb.* Cent. 5. p. 1147. &c.

An Hist. Account of Pelagius

But as to *Pelagius*, the Magdeburgs do give this Account of him, from *Austin*, and *Lucellus*, Cent. 5. pag. 1451. *viz. that he was full of zeal, and affection, and that his beginning was good, and holy* (so that, if he was a Monk of Bangor, he began well) *And that by the Catholicks he was prefered, and made one of the Monks of Syria, and that having lived long at* Rome, *went from thence* to England, *which Island he wholly infected with his Error* (by which it appears, that if he was one of that Society, yet that he got his poyson to broad, both of one kind, and of another) *That after he fell into this Error, he wrote many Books, and many Epistles to the learned Men of this Age, whereby he infested the Universal Church; And several Fathers opposed him, viz. Jerom, Austin, and others; and that his Books were condemned by many Synods, and Councels*, Magdeb. Cent. 5. pag. 894, 586, 587.

Now therefore what ground Mr. *Wills* hath to conclude, the History of those Churches, and his Book also, in that manner he doth, is submitted to his better consideration, and the judicious Reader, and which they find in the following words, *viz.*

And in reference to the confidence of my Antagonist, that the Waldenses, Donatists, *and* Brittains, *were against Infants Baptisms; when none of them*

were

were. I shall conclude with a Distich, which I think may not improperly be applyed to his whole Discourse:

Ridiculus tandem ecce Cavis Mus prodit ab antris,
Quem gravidi Montes parturiere dim.

And from what hath been said, I see no Reason why Mr. D. should be so much offended with Mr. Marshal, and Mr. Baxter, for saying Infants Baptisme was but lately opposed, by the Anabaptists in Germany; and do appeal to the Reader, whether Mr. Baxter doth not speak true, in his plain Scripture proof, pag. 153. who saith, that for his part he cannot find in his (malegrounding) any one Divine, or party of Men, did certainly oppose, or deny Infants Baptisme, for many hundred years after Christ. And then again p. 261. the World may see, what a cause you put such a face upon, when you cannot give the least proof, so much as of one Man (we will allow them one, viz. Hincmarus: what not Adrianus too? that is hard;) much lesse Societies, and least of all godly Societies, that did once oppose, or deny Infants Baptisme, from the Apostles dayes, till about Luthers time.

Amongst

Amongſt the ſeveral Erratas committed by the Preſs, the Reader is deſired to correct theſe that follow, *viz.*

Pag. 4. *l.* laſt, *r.* cleanſing. *p.* 5. *l.* 6. *r.* it. *p.* 6. *l.* 7. *r.* excepts. *l.* 13. *r.* four. *p.* 7. *l.* 20. blot out *firſt*. *l.* 22. *r.* Baptiſme. *p.* 9. *l.* 7. *r.* it, *for* is. *l.* 26. *r.* there were. *pag.* 19. *l.* 27. *r.* their. *p.* 20. *l.* 19 *r.* their. *p.* 21. *l.* 13. *r.* words. *p.* 30. *l.* 27. *r.* infamy. *p.* 35. *l.* 25. *r.* theſe. *p.* 36. *l.* 33. *r.* he cites. *p.* 44. *l.* 24. *r.* ſpeaks. *p.* 45. *l.* 33. *r.* bearing. *l.* 24 *r.* had. *p.* 59. *l.* 26. *r.* At cum. *p* 80. *l.* 29. *r.* the, *for* they. *p.* 86. *l.* 26. *r.* ad Romanos incertus eſt. *p.* 88. *l* laſt, *r.* Arminianiſme, *for* Arianiſme. *p.* 95. *l.* 24. *r.* for. *l.* 27. *r.* both a like. *p.* 100. *l.* 24 *r.* for. *p.* 101. *l.* 13. *r.* Paraphraſe. *p.* 105 *l.* 26 *r.* Giſlbertus. *p* 107. *l.* 9. *r.* impoſing, *for* Fathering. *p.* 114. *l.* l. laſt. *r.* that ſhould. *p.* 115. 5. *r.* is I think, *for* which I think is. *p.* 122. *l.* 8. *r. for* what were, were *p.* 125. *l.* 12. *r.* affirms, *for* deny. *p.* 128. *l.* 15. *r.* had Schools. *p.* 148. *l.* 23. 29. *r.* tell, *for* tells. *p.* 159. *l.* 19. *r.* Fifthly, *for* Fifty. *l.* 20. *r.* the, *for* them. *pag.* 158. *l.* 8. *r.* profeſs. *l.* 14. blot out *a* *p.* 142. *l.* 4. *r.* Armes, *for* Armies. *In the Preface*, Miniſts, *for* Mineſters.

CHAP. IV.

Wherein you have the Stories concerning the German Anabaptists *reviewed, and the Principles and Practise of* Anabaptistry (*as Mr.* Wills *calls it*) *vindicated against his reproaches.*

IN the reflection I made upon the Story of *Tho. Munzer*, and *John of Leyden*, for whose sakes so much *obloquy* hath been cast upon the *Anabaptists* and their way, ever since: I principally intended these two things. What before said herein.

First, to shew the *unreasonableness* of charging the *innocent* with the crimes of such as are *guilty*: And to this Mr. *Wills* in the general *consents*, though he tells us withall, the *suspicion he hath, of the Principle of Anabaptistry it self.*

Secondly, I gave a brief *account* of matter of *fact*, and therein shewed that those *Germane commotions* were not *Anabaptistical* in their *Original*, but moved upon the same pretentions, as the *Helvetians* and others before them had done; then gave the reasons why I thought there was ground to doubt of the *truth* of what was reported concerning the horrid *crimes* committed by them in their *communion*.

Mr. Wills res Objections,

In answer hereunto Mr. *Wills* reproves me. First, *for denying those motions to be Anabaptistical.* Secondly, *for making an odious Comparison betwixt those commotions and them in Helvetia*, p. 103. Thirdly, for *mistaking matter of fact in the Original of the Munster commotion.* Fourthly, As *being extreamly scandalous for my doubts concerning those horrid impieties in Munster.* And Fifthly, he *charges the Principle it self as naturally leading to immorality and division.*

To these I make this brief reply.

Why the Commotions in Swevia not Anabaptistical

First, that the *Commotions in Swevia* 1635. were not *Anabaptistical* appears by their twelve demands, which you have mentioned at large by *Osiander* Cent. 16. c. 36. p. 100. *Wherein is not one word savouring of Anabaptism, but about freedom from Exactions, and to deliver themselves from the Tyranny (as they say) of their Princes and Bishops more Helvetiorum* (which *Gnodolius* also informs us, as I before mentioned) being much of the same nature with those other *Demands* made by the *Rusticks* twenty three Years before (which was the Year after the Revolt of *Berne* and *Schafhuisen*) of which you have also an account in *Osiander Cent.* 16 *L.* 1. *c.* 6. *p.* 10. And that these commotions were not *fomented* and principally *managed* by the *Anabaptists* may appear; First from those first *Demands*, which were principally made and managed by the *Papists*, as *Osiander* and *Bishop Jewel* against *Harding*

In-

inform, and the Articles themselves express; and that the Latter Demands in 1625. were principally carried on by the *Lutherans*, (though it is true *Luther* afterwards Writ against them) as *Osiander* tells us. In *which attempt also that Year fell of them* (as *Pagius* in his *Heriseographia informs us*) *one hundred and fifty thousand*; the hundred part whereof could not be *Anabaptists*.

To the second he tells us *it is both odious and injurious, to compare those attempts of* Geneva *and the* Switzers *with those in* Swevia, *when none, as he saith, can be such Diabols as to charge the* Switzers *with Robbing the Nobility, Plundring of Towns, and Castles, Rifling of all that was Sacred, as those* Germans *did.*

To which I say, that the Chronicles themselves can best inform how those *Cantons* formerly, and those of *Basil Schaffhusen* and *Geneva* since did manage their *Confederacies*, surprize their *Towns* and *Castles*, dispossess their *Princes*, and *Bishops*; and possess themselves of their *Revenues*, Civil and Ecclesiastical. For my part I am yet to learn (from what ever I read) where the difference lay in the attempts, only that those Cantons had better Conduct and *prospered*, and the other had neither *Conduct* nor *Success*, but miscarried in both; which if the other had done, as much *odium* might have befallen them. And you'l find some *Protestant* Writers as well as *Papists* to charge as much *irregularity* on the undertaking of the one, as of the other.

Why the Comparisions not odious as charged.

who will tell you, that the *Boores* in *Germany*, and they of *Munster*, might as warrantably turn out their *Princes*, *Bishops*, and *Canons*; and poſſeſs themſelves of their *Revenues*, as *Geneva*, and thoſe of *Helvetia* had done. And we are not ignorant of the ſeveral attempts that the City of *Munster* hath made within a few years, ſince wholly *Popiſh*, to deliver themſelves from the *Exactions* of their *Bishop*; which by the *Bishop* hath been eſteemed no leſs ſeditious and *rebellious*, than the former.

Thirdly as to the Originall of the Munſter commotion, though he grants the turning out of the Biſhops, Cannons, &c. out of the Churches, and the City alſo, by the Reformiſts, *Yet tells me, I ſpeak falſely in ſaying, that Spanheimius tells us that it came to Arms betwixt the Biſhops and City, who ſaith the quite contrary, and tells us (as he ſaith) that it never came to blows.*

That the firſt ſtirrs in *Munſter* was about Proteſtant Reformation..

To which I ſay, my words you'l find are theſe, *viz. That Spanheimius* and *Oſiander* tells us, that the firſt ſtirrs in the City was about the *Proteſtant Reformation*, the Senate ſiding with *Rotman* and others of the *Miniſters* againſt the *Papiſts* and their Biſhops, that oppoſed them to Arms, and this before the coming in of *John a Leyden*.

Mr. Wills very partial.

I ſay *Spanheimius* and *Oſiander* tells us, &c. He takes notice only of the former, and it is manifeſt they both of them ſpeak of thoſe firſt ſtirs about turning out the Biſhops, Canons;

Spanhemius it seems speaks very briefly of the difference and *Agreement* that happened betwixt the *Bishop* and *Senate* thereupon. Though I must tell *Mr. Wills* it is his mistake to say, that *Spanhemius* denies it came to Armies; for he saith no such thing; But *Osiander* from *Sleyden* goes to particulars: And tells us, how the *Bishop* drew a Force down to a Neighbouring Village called *Telgete*, stopt and streightned them of provision (for so saith *Sleiden*) And sent messengers to command the *restoring* of the *Canons* to their *Churches* again, and the turning out of Town the new *Preachers*: But how that instead thereof they detayned his *Messengers*, and sent a party out of the *Town* in the *Night* and *surprized* and brought away Prisoners, diverse of the *Bishops* men; and that he himself had been taken also, if he had not gone out of his Quarters, that *Night* before. And if this could be done without Arms, and Blows, let all Men judge: and whether the reproof doth not more properly belong to *Mr. Wills* than my self therein.

Fourthly, As to the *Suspition* (why I supposed there was cause to doubt) of the truth of those monsterous Villanyes acted in their Communities in the Latter part of the Siege, as mentioned by their malitious enemies the *Papists*, and many of their inveterate enemies the *Protestants*, *He saith it is extreamly scandalous in two respects: First for calling into Question the matter of fact, especially as reported by the Protestants, who were not* (as he saith) *inve-*

[illegible] Secondly, For endeavouring to palliate such horrid actings of the Anabaptists, a thing never done by any.

Why cause to suspect some of the reports about *Munster*.

In answer whereto I say let it in the first place be remembred, that as to the first part of my suspicion, why those horrid enormities reported might be scandals, *viz.* From the reports given them by the lying *Papists* (who speak as bad things of *Calvin* and *Luther* themselves, and of the Waldenses before them, as you have heard) he seems silently to own. But his great offence lies against me for *questioning* the truth of what is said thereof by the *Protestant* Writers such as *Sleiden*, *Osiander*, *Spanhemius*, *Zwinglius*, &c. *who were* (as he saith) *most faithful historians, grave Divines, and who gave punctuallly the Circumstances of time, place, opinions, &c. And from whom he transcribes the Story: And that my injurious reflection upon them, at though they were the Anabaptists inveterate enemies and that they were willing to take up and improve such reports, to blast not only the whole party of the Anabaptists but their Principles also, against whom they contended, savour in me* (as he saith) *of no less then the ebullition of a Malicious, or at best a prejudiciall Spirit.*

First from Papists.

Secondly, Several Protestants.

To which I say, how shall we be assured, that these later writers did not make their Reports from the *Popish Writers*. For *Sleiden* wrote not his *comentary* till 1555. about twenty years after the fact, and *Osiander* only transcribes from

Sleiden

Sleiden. And as for *Spanheimius* he wrote not till eighty years after *Sleiden*, upon whom *Mr. Wills* lays the greatest stress, and who appears to be a *very partial* and *unfaithful writer* respecting the *Anabaptists* in that his Historicall Narration printed 1646. First falsely assuming that *Stork, Stubner, and Muntzer, were the beginners of Anabaptism*, and who *First* (as his own words express) *helpt the world to be delivered of that Sect.* Secondly *in his malicious charging the Anabaptists with all the old Heresies, that he could reckon up in any old Author, viz. That they were Manicheans, Audians, Anthropomorphites, Tritheits, Samosatenians, Noetians, and Sabellians: Apollinarists, and Prodianites, Anastations, Nestorians, Eutichians, Corinthians, Photinians, Oregenians, Catharists, Novatians, Donatists, Parmenians, Marcionites, Eunomians, Montanists, Nicolaites, Basilidians, Cataphrigians, Gnosticks, Pelagians, and Socinians.* All which Opinions, he enlargeth upon, and applies to them, then which what could savour more of the ebullition of a Malicious Spirit?

And as for *Zwinglius* he could give no account of his business, who dyed five years before it, *viz.* 1531. But as to this great friendship (*Mr. Wills* boasts of) *By the gentleness and tenderness that he shewed to those Anabaptists, that fell off from his Church, whom he treated not as Enemies, but as his intimate friends* (as he tells us) I shall give you some particular account, wherein you will find what is that

Zwinglius cruel Enemy with the Anabaptists.